

The Classical Review

JULY 1887.

FRAGMENTA HERCULANENSIA.

Fragmenta Herculanea: A descriptive catalogue of the Oxford copies of the Herculanean rolls, together with the texts of several papyri, accompanied by facsimiles. Edited, with introduction and notes, by WALTER SCOTT, M.A., Fellow of Merton College, Oxford. Clarendon Press, 1885. 21s.

THE author of this volume was called away from England in the winter of 1884-5 to succeed Dr. Badham in the chair of Classics at Sydney, Australia, leaving behind him a brilliant reputation in Oxford for so young a man. The work before us he left just ready for the press; nor has it lost anything from the absence of the author. The printing is worthy of the Clarendon, and Mr. Wallace M. Lindsay appears to have corrected the proof-sheets with scrupulous care.

Most English scholars are aware of the laborious volumes of papyri which have slowly proceeded from the Naples press, or have read with interest the contributions to this study made by Professor Comparetti of Florence, or by Professor Gomperz of Vienna, of whom the latter may be said to have made this province especially his own. It will, however, be a surprise to many readers to learn that the first work done for the study of the Herculanean rolls was done by an English scholar, assisted by English patrons; and that the earliest attempt to estimate their value is to be found in the *Edinburgh* and *Quarterly Reviews* of 1810. It may surprise them yet more to read that George IV. (when Prince of Wales) and afterwards Sir Humphry Davy were among the principal Englishmen who interested themselves in the matter; it will surprise them most of all to find that, although only eight original rolls are now in England and the rest at Naples, and although nowhere except at Naples, in the *Officina dei Papiri*, is there any one with the skill to unroll these charred relics, yet the best copies of the

papyrus-texts in existence are [in the Bodleian.

These copies were made at Naples in 1802-1806 by the Rev. John Hayter, chaplain to the Prince of Wales. His work was interrupted by the French invasion in 1806; and in 1809 he returned to England, bringing with him all the lead-pencil facsimiles made by himself, besides eighteen made before his arrival in Italy; the whole collection was presented by the Prince to the University of Oxford, and deposited in the Bodleian in 1810. Since that time the Italian scholars have gone on unrolling and deciphering fresh papyri, and making independent copies of those already deciphered by Hayter. Small blame attaches to them if, in a task like this, their results have been given to the world by slow degrees: it is a more serious fault that the Naples texts are not distinguished by that accuracy which is the primary obligation of the specialist, seeing that his results have pretty much to be taken for granted by more general students.

An effort was made by the University in 1824 to publish the Bodleian facsimiles. In that year appeared *Herculaneum Volumen*, *Pars I.*, and in 1825 a *Pars II.*, the two volumes merely containing lithographs of seven of the lead-pencil copies. The editor is not known; *Pars I.* contains a brief preface and a meagre catalogue of the Bodleian copies. But no apparatus criticus, still less any commentary, accompanied the texts, and no attempt was made to restore readings, or discover even the sequence of pages. Since then the bulk of the collection lay in the Bodleian, entombed in an oblivion almost as complete as befell their originals at Herculaneum, until in 1863 they were examined by Professor Gomperz. Their value is due to the fact that many of the frail originals have suffered damage since Hayter and his assistants made their copies, so that the Naples texts are often less com-

plete. Of course in the case of the rolls that have been opened since 1806, we must start with the Naples edition, and verify it by collation with the originals, if still existing. But the text of the remainder can only be settled by a comparison of these three data—the Bodleian copies, the Naples edition, and the original papyri.

Perhaps the neglect which these documents have suffered at the hands of English scholars was a sort of reaction from the curiosity aroused by their first discovery. When it turned out that these papyri, unrolled and read at so heavy a cost of time and money, contained chiefly fragments of second rate Epicurean philosophy, it was perhaps pardonable if disappointment bred indifference. It must also be freely allowed that the Herculanean rolls cannot compare in interest with the papyri from Fayum of a not much later date, which are uninjured by fire, and, although mere fragments, are fragments from the priceless stores of Alexandrian learning.¹ Nevertheless, it is no small privilege to be admitted into the library of Philodemus, the contemporary of Cicero (*In Pis.* 28-9, *De Fin.* ii. 35), to which all the Herculanean rolls apparently belonged. They are among the earliest Greek MSS. in existence, and of high interest on palaeographical grounds. And uninverting as the scholastic subtleties of Epicurean theology may seem, the students of the *De Natura Deorum*, bk. i., have been very grateful for the help contributed from this source to the interpretation of some of the most obscure passages in Cicero (see Mr. J. B. Mayor, *De N. D.*, vol. i., pp. xlvi. foll.). The biographical rolls, including letters of Epicurus and his friends—and indeed any considerable fragments of Epicurus' own works—cannot fail to add to our knowledge. It may also be hoped that in the yet unopened rolls, or in the unpublished texts of those already opened, or again in some of the treatises of Philodemus and others on the subject of poetry and rhetoric, there may yet be gleaned some precious fragments of lost Greek literature.

The scope and contents of Mr. Scott's work will be best set forth in his own words:—‘In the present volume are contained: I. A catalogue of the Oxford facsimiles of the Herculanean rolls, showing what has hitherto been done, and what still remains to be done, towards utilising the materials contained in

the collection. The catalogue consists of two parts. In the first part, all the Oxford facsimiles are given in the order in which they occur in the seven bound volumes of the Oxford collection. . . . In the second part, certain papyri, known to form parts of the same work, or clearly connected by the similarity of their contents, are grouped together. Those of the Oxford facsimiles included in this group are given in both parts, with a reference from the first part to the second.’ The sequence of the Oxford copies has been so utterly disarranged, that the work here done by Mr. Scott will save future students a vast amount of trouble. He has brought Hayter's copies into relation with the Naples texts, citing in each case the literature which has gathered round each papyrus. None but those who have gone over the same ground are qualified to judge with authority of this part of the work; but one may be permitted to admire the ingenious and painstaking labour which is evinced on every page. This catalogue will be an indispensable handbook for all scholars who shall attempt the study of the Herculanean papyri.

The restoration of a tolerably complete and certain text is rendered in many cases possible by several important circumstances. Sometimes the charred rolls have been accidentally broken into two halves, which have been unrolled independently of each other; so that pages which at first were thought to be mutilated can be completed as soon as scholars (led by external as well as internal evidence) have brought the two portions together again. Something has been already said of the value of the Oxford copies as supplementing and often correcting the Italian texts. But more important help is due to the fact that Philodemus appears to have accumulated in his *capsae* duplicate copies of his own works; so that repeatedly it is found that two different rolls have identical contents, and mutually complete their readings. Moreover, the method of composition adopted by these later philosophers (including assuredly Cicero himself), of incorporating whole passages of previous writers into their own treatises, is a further source of assistance. Such wholesale plagiarism is only second to the existence of duplicate MSS. as a help to the task of restoration.² Examples of all these methods

¹ Our readers are doubtless familiar with the interesting lecture of Dr. Hartel, ‘Ueber die Griechischen Papyri Erzherzog Rainer’ (Wien, 1886).

² It will be remembered how Jacob Bernays disengaged five important ‘excerpta’ from Theophrastus, *Νεπτιονέβετας*, which are incorporated by Porphyrius in his treatise *De Abstinencia (Theophrastos’ Schrift über Frömmigkeit*, Berlin, 1886).

of restoration are given in Parts II. and III. of the volume.

Professor Scott has printed 'A restored text of two rolls (pap. 157-152 and 26), the Naples facsimiles of which have already been published, the first in the *Collectio Prior*, and the second in the *Collectio Altera*. The Oxford facsimiles have been reproduced to accompany the text. . . .' Also, 'the text of three of the best preserved rolls in the Oxford collection, not hitherto published in any form,—pap. 19-698, 1,013, and 862. . . The texts here given are in all cases based on a collation of the Oxford facsimiles, the Naples (published or unpublished) facsimiles, and the originals' (at Naples). One of the texts here given is entitled *Φιλοδήμου περὶ θεῶν διαγωγῆς*, the interpretation of which had already been attempted by Mr. Scott in the *Journal of Philology*, xii. p. 245. Another is *Φιλοδήμου περὶ θεῶν ἀ*. A third is anonymous, but is conjectured to be by Philodemus, and is entitled provisionally by the editor *Περὶ αἰσθήσεων*.

An Appendix (Part IV.) gives to the world, for the first time, impressions of copper-plates of some of Hayter's facsimiles, prepared before 1813 under Hayter's own direction, for the publication then contemplated by the University. "These engraved plates were completely forgotten, and have only been rediscovered in the present year" (p. 5).

Mr. Scott is careful to insist on the amount of work that yet remains to be done for the editing of the Herculanean texts. The first step to be taken is the publication of the Bodleian copies. 'As a preparation for the restoration of the texts, it is essential that the more important of the Oxford facsimiles hitherto unpublished should be reproduced . . . and issued in a form generally accessible,' (p. 11). There are also in England, yet unopened, eight rolls (three at Oxford, one at Windsor, four in the British Museum). These precious relics should be placed in the skilful hands of the Naples operators and unrolled, and their contents given as early as possible to the world. One of the Bodleian rolls (fourth) was in 1883 sent under Mr. Scott's charge to Naples and was unrolled, but without result; to his disappointment, it proved to be charred beyond recovery. When these several steps have been taken, it will next remain to revise the texts by a collation of the originals (when extant) with the Naples copies and (where possible) with the Oxford facsimiles. Then, and not till then, shall we have a final text of the fragments. At

present the student of Greek philosophy or philology will do well to use great caution in employing the unrevised texts. How dangerous it is to take for granted the accuracy of the texts hitherto published, may be seen by two examples. A 'geographical fragment' in Ionic Greek is published by Herscher at the end of the 'Teubner' text of Aelian. It purports to have been deciphered from a Herculanean papyrus by a German named Sickler in 1817. The fragment (useless in itself) was in all probability forged by Sickler as a bait to deceive the English authorities, and on the strength of it he was actually employed to operate on the rolls then in England under the superintendence of a Parliamentary Committee. The only results of his performance were the utter destruction of seven rolls, and the expenditure of £1,200 (p. 6, 7). Our other example shall be the title of Pap. 157-152 given by the Naples editors as *Φιλοδήμου περὶ τῆς τῶν θεῶν εὐστοχουμένης διαγωγῆς κατὰ Ζήνωνα*, which is accepted as really from the MS. in Zeller's *History of Philosophy*, and also by Mr. J. B. Mayor, in his edition of the *De Natura Deorum*. 'Of this,' says Mr. Scott (p. 95), 'Φιλοδήμου περὶ is certainly, and διαγωγῆς probably, right: and there must have been some mention of the gods. The rest is due, like much else, to the imagination of the Naples editor.' The fact is, it is too much to expect the text of documents like these (and the same thing has been found true of coins and marbles) to be constituted by a single effort. What a long and distinguished succession of scholars has worked at the text of the Greek dramatists, and of the New Testament! And yet even there the text is not yet convincingly settled. Much more is there need of caution and patience in dealing with documents so difficult to recover, so utterly disarranged, so often mutilated and obscure; scholar after scholar must contribute his share of labour—

ἄλλος παρ' ἄλλου διαδοχαῖς πληρούμενοι.

There will be room for only one or two remarks upon certain details.

To the peculiarities tabulated on pp. 15, 16, may be added the form *εἴδαν* (p. 251), well known to Greek Testament students; again, *παρωσκενάζεν* (p. 232) needs no correction, being a genuine Greek form (see Meisterhans, *Grammatik der Attischen Inschriften*, p. 39), such doubling of Σ being not uncommon.

Some of the forms mentioned on pp. 15,
o 2

16, *e.g.* πώρω and νωήσεων would not be likely to occur in inscriptions earlier than 100 A.D. But *a* for *i* and *vice versa* is a common interchange from 100 B.C. onwards. The peculiar substitution of *η* for *εια* in words like ἐτεμέληρα, ενσέβηηα, which became extremely common in Augustan times (*circa* B.C. 35-A.D. 50) all through Greece, and afterwards entirely ceased, has been often accounted for by the influence of the Latin ē (in Medea, &c.,) upon Greek orthography: see Meisterhans, p. 23. I have sought in vain for an instance of this kind in Mr. Scott's papyri (ἀπγρον for ἀπειρον, p. 15, is not exactly typical). This may confirm the opinion that they belong to the age of Cicero rather than of Augustus. Forms like ἐγβάλλεων, ἐγλογῆς, ἄμ μή, μέγ γάρ are interesting survivals of older Greek spelling, such as meet us occasionally in the MSS. of the New Testament; but the more frequent avoidance of such assimilations, *e.g.* ἐνκατέλπει, ἀνακαίος, ἐργειον (= ἔγγιον), exemplifies a tendency which becomes increasingly noticeable in the last two centuries B.C. Mr. Gow, in the *Journal of Philology* (vii. 1883, p. 278), has already called attention to the mixed employment in these papyri of the alphabetical ciphers and of the initial or 'Attic' numeral system. The stichometric marks are all but invariably given by means of 'initial' notation; indeed, the only exception appears to be

that mentioned by Mr. Scott on p. 41, which is an odd combination of both systems (pap. 1414). On pp. 29, 30, Mr. Scott is surely right in reading (in what seems to be the conclusion of a lecture by Philodemus) καὶ τῆς καλῆς Μ(ι)λέτου μή ἀποστάντι διαπαττός Εἰρηναῖφ, and in translating 'Irenaeus, who has never abandoned fair Miletus.' Why, however, he should conjecture the phrase 'to abandon fair Miletus' to have been a proverb is not so clear. Why not suppose Irenaeus to be a philosophic friend of the lecturer, whose home was at Miletus and who had declined a pressing invitation to Italy? The name Εἰρήναος and its cognates occur often in that neighbourhood; *e.g.* C.I.G. 2885 (Miletus), Εἰρηνίας, LeBas-Waddington, *Asie* 1568 bis (Miletus); Εἰρηνίας (or Εἰρήνιος?) in the Milesian award about Messene (Dittenberger, *Sylloge*, 240); Εἰρήνιος (*sic*) in the *Hellenic Journal*, 1886, p. 144 (Samos); and the Christian Father Irenaeus is another instance connecting the name (though not uncommon elsewhere, *e.g.* at Athens) with Ionia. Mr. Scott has very properly adopted Professor Gomperz's system of brackets and other signs to indicate doubtful or restored letters and words; it is a pity, however, that this system is quite different from the method which has been so admirably devised by the Berlin editors of the *Corpus Incriptionum Atticarum*.

E. L. HICKS.

THE OXFORD AVIANUS.

The fables of Avianus edited, with prolegomena, critical apparatus, commentary, excursus, and index by ROBINSON ELLIS, M.A., LL.D., Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford, University Reader in Latin. Oxford at the Clarendon Press. 1887. 8vo. pp. xliv, 151. 8s. 6d.

The publication in 1883 of Mr. Rutherford's *Babrius* determined the present edition of *Avianus*.

FOR several years Mr. Ellis, in the study of Maximianus and Orientius, has been led to the neglected writers of the decline. He justly complains that interpretation has not kept pace with criticism even in Germany. 'No adequate edition of Ammianus exists.' With due gratitude to the excellent editors Lindenbrok and the two De Valois (to say nothing of James Gronov), we must allow that the monographs in which Hertz and

others have analysed the mosaic of Ammianus, need condensation in one exhaustive commentary, and that current texts may gain by the aid of Madvig and other recent critics.

Ellis has but one predecessor as an interpreter of Avianus, Hendrik Cannegieter (24 Febr. 1691—21 Aug. 1770). He is not, I think, ungenerous, when he says:

Judged by modern standards, Cannegieter performed his task only tolerably well. His notes are cumbrous and loaded with useless citations, as well as unnecessary or improbable conjectures.

Yet, having carefully studied Cannegieter's book from the first page to the last, I wish to say a word on his behalf. Avianus was his first publication, and he continued to publish for thirty-five years after its appearance. I learn from the Dutch Biographical

Dictionary of Van der Aa that thirty years ago his papers, including additions to his published works, were in the hands of the family Burghgraaf at Franeker. Will some Dutch correspondent make inquiries on the spot?

Ellis quotes the criticisms of Wopkens, and his reply to Cannegieter's defence, and also the notes of that master of Latin poetry, Fr. Guyet.¹ In the same volume with the two latter pieces (Misc. obss. crit. VIII, Amst. 1737, pp. 1-20) appeared Cannegieter's defence, where he points out e.g. that fab. 7 4 and fab. 25 6 both end with the words *richtibus ora trahens*. These notes have apparently escaped Ellis. Indeed I have found in the older commentary not a few illustrations which I had searched for in vain in the new; some of these I give below, marked with an asterisk. Cannegieter was a grateful disciple of the great Perizonius (see p. 159 'cuius me disciplinis formatum esse, in prima felicitatis parte pono, nec merita obliviscar unquam') and bequeathed his interest in the later Latin to his pupils, the elder and younger Arntzenius, as may be seen in their successive prefaces. His own preface to Avianus displays to the life the busy hive of that Dutch school, which it is now the fashion to disparage, but which has rendered lasting service to accurate scholarship.

In his Prolegomena Ellis treats of the age of Avianus (or Avienus, for he identifies him with one of the company in Macr.), the prosody of the fables, diction and syntax, the mss.

With many recent critics he holds that the Theodosius of the dedication is the author Macrobius, and proves (as Cannegieter had done most convincingly) that he cannot have been either of the emperors Theodosius. So far Ellis is on solid ground. Going on, he is wise beyond what is written. For I cannot think that Ausonius (Grat. Act. § 41 *habes ergo consiliatorem et metuus proditorem*) alludes to fab. 26 11 12:

*nam quamvis rectis constet sententia verbis,
suspectam hanc rabidus consiliator habet;*

or that where Symmachus complains (ep. I 101) of the difficulty of congratulating a consul's appointment while lamenting a brother's death (*duae mihi simul personae*

¹ Ellis nowhere states where these are to be found. They are among the *adversaria* of Jo. Scheffer of Strassburg (who derived them from Nic. Heins) and fill pp. 423-6 of the volume cited. I was put on the right scent by Fabricius-Ernesti Bibl. Lat. Teuffel makes no mention of Guyet.

disparas offeruntur. qui fieri potest ut os unum contrariis affectionibus iudicamus?) he has in mind the traveller blowing hot and cold (fab. 29 22 *tam diversa duo qui simul ora ferat*). Indeed the language of Symmachus more nearly resembles St. James 3 9-12. Again, when Ellis, after Unrein, makes Macrobius (Comm. I 2 § 7 *fabulae, quarum nomen indicat falsi professionem.* cl. §§ 9, 10) allude to the words in our fabulist's dedication *fabularum textus occurrit, quod in his urbane concepta falsitas deceat et non incumbat necessitas veritatis,* I doubt whether Clinton would have built a chronological argument on such a foundation. To me both writers suggest the school definition of *μῆθος, fabula, λόγος ψευδῆς εἰκονίζων ἀλήθεαν* (Aphthon. progymn. 1), *fabula est, in qua nec verae nec veri similes res continentur* (Cic. inv. I § 27. cf. Philostr. in Ellis p. 50).

With regard to sins of prosody Avianus is here successfully cleared from not a few. Possibly he allowed a syllable, short by position, at the end of the first half of the pentameter; but no great violence need be done in order to correct the ten examples which occur. Of other faults we may get rid of *velis* in one place 23 10 (Lachmann's conjecture is wrongly given on p. xxiv.) by reading:

sive deum, busti seu decus esse velis.

The chapter on the diction and syntax of Avianus will be of service to grammarians and lexicographers. Of mss. eleven have been collated throughout by the editor (one Paris, three Oxford, two Peterhouse, four British Museum, one Trèves, one St. Gallen fragment) and others examined. The Gale ms. was collated by Munro for Bährens. Various readings are given at the foot of the page. A strict adherence to Cobet's rules might perhaps have lightened the margin so far as to make room for *auctores et imitatores*, which a sound tradition (as e.g. in Schenkl's Calpurnius) now places immediately under the text. In the commentary Bodleian mss. of a Greek paraphrase are cited.

I add a few illustrations.

P. 1 l. 2 *in utroque litterarum genere.* Add to my note on Iuv. xv 110 Sidon. c. 25 (= 23 p. 582 Baret) 236 *commercia duplicitis loquellae.* Ov. a. a. II 122 *linguas...duas.* Egger Hist. de la Critique 540.

Fab. 2 13 *exosae* pass. the passage of Macrobius is cited again on 33 6; also, with this of Avianus, and six other examples, by Georges, whose lexicon would, if consulted,

have relieved this commentary of much unnecessary repetition. Georges has not the following Liberat. breviar. 24. Clem. recogn. I 5.

Fab. 3 4 *emonuisse* inserted in text by conjecture (codd. *prae-*). When we remember that lexicons are compiled, sometimes without verification, from indexes, and that often (e.g. in this book) the index gives no hint that the word lacks ms. authority, it becomes evident that only absolute certainty, proved by general acceptance, should entitle conjectural $\alpha\pi\alpha\zeta\lambda\epsilon\gamma\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha$ to a place in the text. So below, 10 5, *praeflant* (for *praestant* of codd., *perfiant* Ashb.), though *praestant* is excellently expounded in the note. ib. note on ver. 3 'Prud.' add 'perist.'

Fab. 3 11 12

nam stultum nimis est, cum tu pravissima tempes,
alterius censor si vitiosa notes.

I agree with Wopkens in taking this 'as a general reflexion' (the Clarendon printers insist on *et*, 'reflection'). In the note, *not* has fallen out between *would* and *then*.

Fab. 4 1 Cannegieter excellently defends *ad sidera* cl. 15 *praesentia numina*. Cf. fab. 8 5 6.

Fab. 4 2 *apud magnum...Iovem* would be more natural.

Fab. 4 13 *requiescere membra transitive* also Ign. Trall. 12.

Fab. 6 7 *nec se iactat cessisse* 'a little forced for *et se non cessisse iactat*.' See Drakenb. on Liv. XXXII 10 § 6. Fabri on Liv. XXII 22 § 4. Ov. am. I 6 72. Plin. ep. III 14 § 7. Kühner lat. Gr. II 657.

Fab. 8. Here, as throughout, we crave a larger comparison of fables and proverbs. Even a select bibliography of the later literature of ancient fable would have been acceptable. At any rate Leutsch's note should have been cited (Paroem. II 441-2, Apostol. VIII 43 $\eta\ k\alpha\mu\rho\lambda\oslash\pi\epsilon\iota\theta\mu\rho\gamma\alpha\tau\alpha\ k\epsilon\rho\tau\alpha\ k\alpha\ t\alpha\ \omega\pi\pi\sigma\alpha\pi\omega\lambda\epsilon\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha$). Add schol. Luc. Icarom. 10 (I see that Luc. himself is cited on ver. 5). The German and Dutch lexicons of proverbs (by Wander and Harreméé) are well worth study.

Fab. 9 5 I agree with Guyet that the ms. *dumque per incepturn vario sermone feruntur* need not be altered, e.g. with Cannegieter, Lachmann, Fröhner, Bährens into *incertum*, or with Ellis into *insaeptum* ('unenclosed', cited by Georges from Paulus Festi). A glance at Mühlmann's article 'inceptum' will shew that the words may mean 'pursue their plan,' 'carry out their enterprise.'

Fab. 10 11 *quid mirum?* From the fate

of this phrase in the hands of index-makers we may learn a salutary lesson. Cannegieter's index generally gives phrases, not single words, but here he, as well as Ellis, has *quid* and *mirum* as two separate articles. Even Forcellini supplies only two examples, the hackneyed one from Horace, and one from Ovid. Of the following references I had registered only those from Seneca and Tertullian; the rest I have gathered by the aid of indexes, mostly of the Delphin type, necessitating the examination of every example of *mirum*. I learnt that the majority of Latin writers eschew the phrase, and that *nec mirum* is much more usual. Cic. Verr. v § 6. de domo § 1 *quare quid est mirum, si...?* Prop. IV (v) 4 39 and 41. Ov. her. 15 85. (Paris Oenoneae 69). fasti VI 289. Pont. III 4 63. Manil. IV 886. Curt. V 5 § 12. x 1 § 33 (both q. m. est). Cf. IV 11 § 4 *ecquid m. est, si...?* Sen. de ira II 31 § 4 (q. m. est). prov. 4 § 12. Stat. s. II 1 175. V 3 162. Tert. adv. Marc. II 2 p. m. Mamertin. genethl. Maxim. 14 f. q. *enim m. si...?* Inc. panegyr. Constantio Caes. 6 q. *erit m., si...?* Auson. epitaph. her. 9 4.

Fab. 11 4 (*de duabus ollis*)

sed diversa duas ars et natura creavit,
aere prior fusa est, altera facta luto.

It occurred to me that *ficta* was required in opposition to *fusa*, before I saw that *ficta* has equal authority with *facta* and is read by Bährens. See Justin 36. 4. 4 (of Attalus) *ab hoc studio aerariae artis fabricae se tradit cerisque fingendis et aere fundendo procurando oblectatur.*

Fab. 11 7

ne tamen elisam confringeret aerea testa,
iurabat solidam longius ire viam.

The vast majority of mss. read *testam*, which is required by the opposition to *aerea (olla)*. I do not understand *solidam viam*, whereas the ms. *solitan* is perfectly simple: 'swore to go on, as it had gone, at a distance'; 'to give it a wide berth.'

Fab. 12 1

rusticus impresso molitus vomere terram.

Cf. * Verg. g. I 494

agricola incurvo terram molitus aratro.

Fab. 12. In the note on ver. 9 (p. 72)

The verb *prodere* in the sense of handing on, transmitting, is not uncommon, especially with *memoriae* or *litteris*, each of which is found in Vegetius (III 1, III 26).

Invert the order and read Veg. III *praef.* (p. 63 15 Lang) *litteris. III 26 memoriae.*

(Another *erratum* p. xxxvi l. ult. for x read ix).

Fab. 13 4

Cinyphii duxor qui gregis esse solet.

Cf. * anth. Lat. 117 6 R. *ducit Cinyphii lactea dona gregis.*

Fab. 13 5 *longa de valle* is satisfactorily explained in the note. I see no place for the conjecture *longum* (*locutus*).

Fab. 14 11 *turpissima.*

From * Ennius (not Cicero, as Cannegieter says) Sat. 45 Vahlen (in Cic. n. d. 1 § 97, Seren. Sammon. 825) *simia quam similis turpissima bestia nobis.*

Fab. 15 1 2

*Threiciam volucrem fertur Iunonius ales
communi sociam detinuisse cibo.*

The ms. *continuisse* gives a very good sense and has an exact parallel in 29 5 6

*hunc nemorum custos fertur miseratus in
antro*

exceptum Satyrus continuisse suo.

Fab. 15 11 The conjecture *in numerum* is Cannegieter's, but is wholly needless.

Fab. 16 9 10

*se quoque tam vasto rectam non sistere trunco,
ast illam tenui cortice ferre minas.*

The oak is speaking in the fable of the oak and the reed.

I believe I have restored intelligibility to this line by reading *rectam non sistere* for *needum (rectum C) consistere* of MSS. The objection is not to *needum* being used for *nondum*,... but to its being the exact reverse of what we should expect, *non iam*: for all attempts to force the meaning of 'not yet' into the passage are futile.

I hope not. 'Even she, with so mighty a bole, did not yet stand firm, but the reed with its slender bark braved the storm.' Even yet, adding year by year to her solid strength, she could not hold her ground. *Non iam*, as it seems to me, would be far weaker.

Fab. 17 (in the 9th line of Babr. 1 p. 81 *διαστάς* is misprinted *διαοράς*).

Fab. 17 3 4

*tum pavidis audax cupiens succurrere tigris
verbere commoto iussit adesse minax.*

Neither Ellis nor Fröhner nor Bährens state which MSS. have *adesse*, presumably all but three: I am glad to see that Bährens keeps the received *commota...minas*, 'lashes herself into a rage.'

Fab. 18 5 in the note (p. 83, also pp. 89, 105, 128) Reifferscheid's name is spelt with a *y*.

Fab. 19 3 4

*indijnum referens dumis certamen haberi,
quos meritis nullus consociaret honor.*

Wopkens has sufficiently supported *cunctis*; *dumis* after the *dumos* of ver. 1, seems to me very flat. Like Cannegieter, Schenkl, Bährens, and Ellis himself, I prefer *meriti*.

Fab. 20 5 6 (the little fish begging to be allowed to grow, till he would be worth catching).

*'parce, precor,' supplex lacrimis ita dixit
abortis,
'nam quanta ex nostro corpore dona feres?'*

donna Lachmann for *damna* of MSS... Wopkens' view that *ex nostro corpore* = 'from the loss of my body,' i.e. by giving me up and restoring me to freedom, is harsh, but not impossible.

I agree with Wopkens; *damna* ('damage by returning me to the sea') seems to me far more effective than the *lucra* of the older editors, the *dona* of Lachmann, Fröhner, Bährens, Ellis; 'I ask you to make a sacrifice, but how small a one.'

Fab. 20 12

pinguior ad calatum sponte recurro tuum.

sponte an exaggeration as absurd as the springing tears of the fish in 3.

Yet not beyond the capacity of court flatterers Iuv. IV 69 *ipse capi voluit.*

Fab. 20 13 14

*ille nefas captum referens absolvere pisces,
difficiles queritur cassibus esse vices.*

All MSS. *cassis* which Fröhner changes to *cassibus*. I follow the learned editor in holding this to be true; and it is recommended by its simplicity. Yet Av. may mean merely that accidents are variable and difficult to count upon.

Bährens also reads *cassibus*, and Cannegieter cites one MS. for it. Yet ingenious as it is, I hold it certainly to be wrong; throughout the fable angling, not netting, is spoken of.

Fab. 21 5

sed vox inplumes turbavit, acrecula, nidos.

MSS. have *crecula*, 'acrecula scripsi.' The only scruple which this specious conjecture leaves in my mind, is that the vocative is not sufficiently indicated by the context. Cf. Georges s.v. *acrecula* and * Claud. III cons. Hon. praef. 5 *protinus inplumes convertit ad aethera nidos.*

Fab. 22 5-8

*his sese medium Titan, scrutatus utrumque
optulit, et precibus cum peteretur, ait,*

*praestant di facilis, quae namque rogaverit unus,
protinus haec alter congerminata feret.*

MSS. have *ut peteretur*, with the exception of one, whose first hand wrote *conferetur*, from which Ellis has restored, as it seems to me with certainty, *quom petetur*. In verse 7 the mss. read *prestandi facilis* (one *praestabit facilis*). Fröhner reads *praestandi facilis*, and Bährrens *praestandis facilis*, but this seems very weak, for 'ready to give.' *Praestant di faciles*, on the other hand, makes excellent sense. See my note on Iuv. x 8 *di faciles*.

When a child I read in a magazine a story, which I cannot trace, but which I believe comes from some great mine of folklore and illustrates this fable. A fisherman, bringing a fine fish to court, was only admitted by the porter on promising to share with him its price. The king bid him name his own terms. 'Fifty stripes.' When 25 had been administered, the fisherman cried: 'Hold, I have a partner. He has a right to the remaining half.' 'Where can a second fool like you be found?' 'At your own gate.'

Fab. 22 19 *proventis*. 'The neuter *proventum* is rather rare.' So far as I know this is the only example.

Fab. 23 1 2

*vendor insignem referens de marmore
Baculum
expositum pretio fecerat esse deum.*

May not *referens* mean 'bringing home'? It is nowhere said that the salesman was himself the artist. *De marmore* Verg. georg. III 13. In ver. 2 the rhythm forbids the construction '*fecerat expositum esse*'. Rather 'Had set it out for sale and made of it a god.' Cf. Iuv. x 365-6 *nos te, nos facimus, Fortuna, deam.* With the whole fable cf. * Hor. s. I 8 1-3:

*olim truncus eram ficulnus, inutile lignum,
cum faber, incertus scamnum faceretne Pria-
pum,
maluit esse deum. deus inde ego.*

More in Cannegieter.

Fab. 23 9

et me (seu) defunctis seu malis tradere divis.
See Kühner's lat. Gr. § 220 4 n. 3.

Fab. 23 11 12

*subdita namque tibi est magni reverentia sacri,
atque eadem retines funera nostra manu.*

For *sacri* mss. have *fati* or *facti*. The former is unobjectionable. Nor is *nequitiae*, the reading of some mss. for *namque tibi*, indefensible. 'For to thee (or to villainy, to

sordid avarice) is made subject the worship of a mighty destiny,' i.e. 'whether the marble be destined to receive worship as a god.' Cf. * Tert. apol. 12 *quantum autem de simulacris ipsis, nihil amplius deprehendo, quam materias (or matres) sorores esse vasculorum instrumentorumque communium vel ex isdem vasculis et instrumentis quasi fatum consecratione mutantes, licentia artis transfigurante et quidem contumeliosissime.* Add Minuc. 23 § 9. Athenag. 26 p. 30^b.

Fab. 24 4 *edita continuo fronte sepulchra vident.* MS. *forte* is perfectly simple. 'Chance straightway to espy a lofty tomb.' The archaism *frons* masc. should not be ascribed to Avianus without necessity. Cannegieter well refers on this fable (the Hunter and the Lion) to works of art representing Hercules and the Nemean lion. Strange to say, no one seems to have remembered the famous verses of Xenophanes (fr. 6 Mullach) 'if oxen or lions had hands or could paint as men etc.' cf. Epicharmus in DL. III 16. Cic. n.d. I §§ 76 77.

Fab. 25 8 'ima petit, a Macrobian expression.' See Aen. IX 119 120 *aequora rostris ima petunt.* Lue. IV 127 *ima petit quidquid pendebat aquarum.*

Fab. 26 (pp. xii and 99).

The valuable Latin Glossary 4, 626 in Sir Thomas Phillips' library at Cheltenham contains an extract from Avianus' version of this fable: *Citius est herba de qua Avianus florentem citisum carpe.*

The passage meant is verse 5 *sed cytisi croceum per prata virentia florem.* The author of the gloss was evidently thinking rather of Verg. ecl. I 78 *florentem cytisum et salices carpetis amaras*, which seems to have been in the thoughts of Avianus also, as he continues *et glaucas salices. Florentem cytisum* again Verg. ecl. 2 64.

Fab. 28 1 *vincla recusanti.* From Aen. VII 15 16

*iraeque leonum
vincla recusantum.*

Fab. 29 14 *silvarum referens optima.*
From Iuv. I 135 *optima silvarum.*

Fab. 22 Freund and his followers (Riddle-White and Lewis-Short) state that the *o* in *duo* is found long only once (in Ausonius). Georges has no example. Ellis quotes three passages of Prudentius.

Fab. 30 7 Many additional examples of *praedictus* in the sense of 'aforesaid,' 'above,' will be found in Velleius.

Fab. 31 7 *tunc indignantem lusor sermone fatigans.* The ms. *iusto* will stand, 'fair,' 'deserved.'

Fab. 34 3 Ellis, after Cannegieter, cites *confectus senio* from Valerius Maximus; lex. add. Ennius and Cicero.

Fab. 34 5 6

*solibus erectos homini formica labores
distulit et brevibus condidit ante cavis.*

An exact parallel in Aug. enarr. in ps. 36 serm. 2 § 11 *quemadmodum formica abscondit in cavernosis penetralibus labores aestatis.*

Fab. 36 1 *pulcher et intacta vitulus cervice resultans.* Cf. * Verg. georg. iv 540 *intacta totidem cervice iuvencas.*

Fab. 39 15 *nam licet ipse nihil possit temptare nec ausis.* The reading of one ms. *ausis*, is probably right, though the *ausus* of the others has a parallel in Aen. ix 428 429 :

nihil iste nec ausus

nec potuit.

Fab. 41 16 *ausa pharetratis nubibus ista loqui.* The parallel *pharetratae brumae*, cited by Ellis, seems convincing; otherwise 'the artillery of the clouds' is not in the quiet vein of Avianus. *Foret tantis*, read by Bährens, is cited by Cannegieter from his 'Cortianus 2.'

Fab. 42 8 *regemens.* Freund and his followers say that this word occurs 'perhaps' only in two passages of Statius; Ellis adds two of Sidonius. Georges has these four examples, with yet two others, one from the Culex, one from Corippus. It would seem impossible to use Freund for a week, without discovering that his general statements about the whole compass of Latinity are to be narrowed (especially from the letter D downwards) to that portion of Latin usage which is stored in Forcellini. Yet his editors repeat his vainglorious *dicta* without suspicion.

After the commentary follows 'Excursus I. *Praesumere*' (in the sense of 'to presume, arrogate'). 'Excursus II. *Coniecturae Babrianae*', originally published in the American Journal of Philology.

The book ends with an index of words (pp. 133-151) for which 'I am indebted to my friend Mr. Charles Bradburne of Trinity College.'

This index seems to include every word but *et* and *que*. I tested it for one fable, and found no error or omission. Each form, as in the Delphin indexes, occurs in its own place (e.g. *verba*, *verbera*, *verbere*, *verberibus*, *verbis*, *verbo*, *verborum*), a much more helpful arrangement than that adopted in Schenkl's Calpurnius, where only one form of each word is registered, (in verbs always the present infinitive). But even this is open

to grave objections, as different cases, genders, parts of verbs, even entirely different words which happen to be spelt alike (e.g. *cum*), are confounded together. Jahn's index to Juvenal is not a model of excellence, but it does aim at sorting the articles according to the various cases etc. Another blot on the index I have already touched upon; it makes no distinction between conjectural readings and those founded on ms. evidence; nay, the latter, if ousted from the text, have no place at all in the index. A fortnight would have sufficed to compile a complete Lexicon Avianianum, which might have recorded the various readings, as Bruder does for the N.T., Meusel and Menge-Preuss for Caesar. Even something far short of a lexicon would have been welcome; thus Cannegieter's index for the two words cited above gives (*verbera caudae*—*mollia*—*prohiberet*—*submittens*; *verbere commotitas minas*; *verberibus donat*; *verba asperiora*—*darent*—*dedisse*—*dedit*—*multa secreta*; *in verba redire*; *verbis compulsus*—*certare*—*fallacibus*—*pravis insistere*—*rectis*; *verbo hoc*; *verborum fidem*).

Cannegieter has also an 'Index II. In Notas' (32 pp.), 'Index III. Scriptorum antiquorum qui in Notis atque in Dissertatione illustrantur, emendantur.' There is so much new and valuable matter in the Oxford edition, that it deserved a good index to the notes. I have enriched the margins of a lexicon with the principal contributions here made to lexicography; but how many will have patience to do likewise?

A singular omission is that of an 'index fabularum.' Cannegieter has an alphabetical one, immediately after his preface: the new edition compels us to consult 45 pages to learn the subjects of the 42 fables. The notes have the monotonous running heading, 'commentary,' so that one must often turn a page to find out where one is. These headings should always form a table of contents.

Mr. Ellis sets a noble example of conscientious diligence, and his works cannot be safely neglected by any serious student of Latin literature. With a few hours more labour, and a few pages more print, he might have enabled us to dispense with all previous editions of Avianus. If in future he will add a complete lexicon to each volume, and make his lexicographical collections subsidiary to the best lexicons of the day, he will not want imitators, and England will contribute her fair quota to that *Thesaurus Latinae Linguae* to which Wölfflin is devoting himself with a rare self-sacrifice.

JOHN E. B. MAYOR.

STUDIA BIBLICA.

Studia Biblica. Essays in Biblical Archaeology and Criticism, and Kindred Subjects.
By MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1885.
8vo. pp. 263. 10s. 6d.

IT is not often that we meet with a volume of more interest than this. Amongst the writers are Profs. Driver, Neubauer, Sanday and Wordsworth (now Bishop).

Prof. Neubauer treats of 'the Dialects spoken in Palestine in the time of Christ,' and the results which he finds probable are: that '(1) in Jerusalem and perhaps also in the greater part of Judea the modernised Hebrew and a purer Aramaic dialect were in use among the majority of the Jews; (2) the Galileans and the Jewish immigrants from the neighbouring districts understood their own dialect only (of course closely related to the Aramaic), together with a few current Hebrew expressions such as proverbs and prayers; (3) the small Jewish-Greek colony and some privileged persons spoke Greek, which was however a translation from the Hebrew rather than genuine Greek, in a word, a Judeo Greek jargon.' Hence he concludes that 'the language which the disciples of Jesus spoke and wrote' was that represented by the Talmud of Jerusalem, a Galilean composition. In this he adopts the conclusion of Böhl (*Forschungen nach einer Volksbibel u.s.w.*). We need not say that he supports his view with much learning, nevertheless there are not a few weak points in his reasoning which is substantially that of De Rossi and Pfannkuche.¹ For example, as a proof that the Septuagint translation was unknown in Palestine except to men of the schools and perhaps a few of the Hellenistic Jews, he cites the well-known condemnation of that version in the Talmud. There is no doubt that the Jews in the second century became dissatisfied with the LXX. (partly perhaps on account of the use made of it by the Christians), and desirous to possess a more literal translation. The *desideratum* was supplied by Aquila and others, with the natural result that the

Septuagint fell into further discredit. It is clear that the language of the Talmud long afterwards has no value as evidence of the light in which the version of the LXX. was regarded in the time of Christ. The use made of it in the New Testament, even in an Epistle to the Hebrews, is contemporary evidence and leads to a different conclusion. The quotations in the Gospels cannot be accounted for by the supposition that they are derived from a Targum, unless that Targum was itself founded on the LXX. But even apart from the New Testament, there is evidence usually considered sufficient, that in the time of the Apostles and earlier the Jews found no fault with the version. The first book of Maccabees exhibits evidence of its influence, and the second book even quotes from it. Nay there is reason to think that the LXX. exercised an influence over the Haggadic exegesis of Palestine. Thus when we are told that the witch of Endor recognised Saul (1 Sam. xxviii. 12) by the fact that Samuel came up on his feet, not on his head, as spirits did to ordinary inquirers, we trace the senseless fable to the Greek rendering *ōphitor*, which is due to a mistake of one letter in the Hebrew (*zaqeph* for *zagen*). Frankel's hypothesis that the rendering *ōphitor* arose from the fable which is then assumed as an ultimate fact is preposterous. Böhl maintains that the LXX. version was so highly esteemed that the Bible in popular use was a translation from it into Aramaic.

The question is not about the total extinction of the language of the Jews, but about the extent to which Greek was understood. Paulus, who held that the Jews of Palestine were largely bilingual, referred to 2 Macc. iv. 13, where it is stated that in the time of Jason (second century B.C.) there was a rage for Greek fashions and a desire to be like the Greeks in everything; this, he observed, favoured the supposition that the language also was widely adopted. De Sacy's reply² is that there was sufficient time afterwards for the Hebrew again to displace the Greek before the time of Christ. But then it must be remembered that Herod also used great efforts to introduce Greek culture. De Sacy indeed, did not feel his victory so easy as Mr. Neubauer thinks, and fell back on what

¹ *On the Language of Palestine in the Age of Christ and his Apostles.* By De Rossi and Dr. H. F. Pfannkuche. Translated by Thorl. G. Repp. Clark's Biblical Cabinet, vol. ii. De Rossi's work is entitled *Della lingua propria di Cristo e degli Ebrei nazionali della Palestina da' temp' de' Maccabei.* Parma, 1772.

² De Sacy's paper is in Millius' *Magasin Encyclopédique* for 1805, tom. i pp. 125-147. It is a review of a Dissertation by Paulus, published in the form of two University Programmes. (Jena, 1803.)

he regarded as the irrefragable argument of the surprise of the multitude on the day of Pentecost. 'Are not all these which speak Galileans?' But the supposition that the surprise was felt simply at Galileans speaking Greek does not satisfy the requirements of the text, which shows that the multitude were surprised that men of so many different countries heard ἔκαστος τῇ ἴδιῃ διαλέκτῳ. Let this pass, however. De Sacy believed that the Apostles spoke Greek by a miracle, and thought that Paulus was biased by disbelief in miracles. If Mr. Neubauer thinks that the Apostles, unlettered Galileans, spoke Greek without a miracle, then he must admit that Greek was pretty widely known in Galilee: what then becomes of his thesis?¹

Mr. Neubauer again asks (following Pfannkuche), 'Why should the chief captain wonder that St. Paul could speak Greek if the Jews were generally familiar with it?' The chief captain has himself answered the question; he did not know that Paul was a Jew, but thought he was an Egyptian. Pfannkuche understands this to mean an Egyptian Jew, and as he thinks that the uncultivated Egyptian Jews knew no Greek, he is consistent in asking the question. But Mr. Neubauer holds that the Jews in Egypt had completely forgotten their language long before this (p. 69); how then is the question in his mouth relevant or consistent? It is worth observing also that St. Luke specially mentions the fact that St. Paul spoke τῇ Ἐβραιϊ διαλέκτῳ, in order to introduce the remark that on this account the people 'were more quiet,' μᾶλλον παρέσχον ἡγρυχίαν. Does not this imply that they would not have been surprised and would have understood, had he spoken Greek?

Again Mr. Neubauer asks: 'Would any one venture to maintain that St. Peter spoke Greek when he addressed himself to the "men of Judea and all that dwell in Jerusalem" and that too at Pentecost, when all the prayers were offered in Hebrew?' as, be it observed, they still are. 'How would the Medes, Elamites and Arabians have understood if he had spoken Greek?' To the first question we may reply that the audience did not consist wholly or perhaps chiefly of men of Judea, and we may quite as effectively

ask, Would Peter have used a language which probably most of his hearers would not understand, especially as we may reasonably suppose that it was principally the strangers that he hoped to influence? The 3000 who were converted were doubtless not Jews of Jerusalem. As to the second question, we need only refer to what Mr. Neubauer himself says (pp. 69, 70) of the Jews in various parts of Asia and elsewhere, who, 'far away from Palestine, spoke only Greek.' In fact are not these Medes and Elamites, etc. the very same men whom he finds just before addressed by the Apostles in Greek, as he holds, and calling it their own dialect or language? Again, referring to St. Luke's statement that Jesus addressed Paul on the way to Damascus in 'Hebrew,' he says that not remembering or being able to supply the Hebrew words, 'he was obliged, in order to be believed, to state that Jesus spoke in Hebrew.' Surely if St. Luke had said nothing about the language used, no reader would have made the omission an objection to the story. A historian does not usually state in what language words were spoken unless he has some special reason for doing so, as St. Luke had in Acts xiv. 11, xxi. 40. His not stating that Peter spoke in Hebrew on the day of Pentecost is not regarded by Mr. Neubauer himself as an objection to the supposition that he did so. In the case of the words addressed to Saul, how much more natural it is to suppose that the Hebrew language is specified because it was not a matter of course than because it was. May we not ask also, 'In what language did Jesus converse with Pilate, or does the historian's silence about the language affect in any way the credit of the story?'

The language of the books of the New Testament is a fact of the first importance in the question. Prof. Neubauer (following Pfannkuche) speaks of the Gospels as translations, and the few Aramaic expressions that occur he describes as 'left by the translators.' Whether he agrees with Pfannkuche in supposing that they were left through inadvertence (!) does not appear. The supposition is contradicted by the fact that, wherever necessary, a translation is subjoined (as, *ex. gr.* to ἐφθαθή and ταλιθή κοῦμι). This circumstance also proves that it was not from inability to find a Greek equivalent that the Aramaic words were retained. We can understand the retention of the words spoken on the cross as necessary to explain the misunderstanding of 'Eli, Eli' as a call for Elias. We may, however, ask in passing, How came the Jewish bystanders (most likely

¹ Perhaps it may not be irrelevant to mention that we have heard persons in Middlesex, who had just been listening to a preacher from Ireland, express surprise that they had been able to understand every word he said. Yet they had not expected that he would speak Celtic. (The preacher, by the way, was after all a native of Essex.)

men of Jerusalem) to make such a mistake? But as to the other expressions quoted, why did not St. Mark say simply: 'λέγει αὐτῷ Διανοίχθητι,' instead of 'λέγει αὐτῷ ἐφφαθά, ὃ ἔστι Διανοίχθητι'? Only two explanations seem easy, either that Jesus himself did not use Aramaic except on particular occasions, or that St. Mark's informant (according to early tradition, Peter), spoke Greek, and only preserved the original Aramaic in these two cases of 'wonder-working' words which we may suppose had strongly impressed themselves on his memory.

A quite different question is that relating to the Aramaic words occurring in the narrative. Of these Prof. Neubauer gives a heterogeneous list. Some are proper names such as Bethesda, Golgotha, Satan, Beelzebul, and from these it is clear that no inference can be drawn. What again can we infer from such words as Rabbi, or Messias, words used to the present day by Jews whatever their vernacular may be? *Kopβář*, again, which is as much Hebrew as Aramaic, is a technical legal term as much as *habeas corpus*, *cessvique*, and other phrases in use amongst ourselves. But what does Mr. Neubauer mean by including in his list words which occur in the LXX., and which therefore formed part of the vocabulary of every Greek-speaking Jew? Such are πάχα, σίκερο (actually quoted from the LXX., Luke i. 15), γέέρνα (Josh. xviii. 16, γαίερνα). The last may indeed be reckoned a proper name. Certainly γέέρνα owes its clipped form to its use by Greek-speaking people. What these really prove is the use of the LXX.; how they can be supposed to support the view that the users did not speak Greek, it is hard to see. *Φαρισαῖος* does not occur in the LXX., but it is a word which would of necessity be adopted by Greek-speaking Jews, having, like γέέρνα, no possible equivalent in Greek. Its form is completely Greek.

Pfannkuche's list (followed by a very recent writer) includes in addition χάρτης, and the Latin words λεγεών, σπεκουλάτωρ, σονδάριον, κολονία. Now χάρτης is found in Greek authorities (Plato Comicus and Inserr.; see Liddell and Scott); σονδάριον, in the Doric form σωδάριον, occurs in a writer of the fifth century B.C. (Hermippus). These examples show how little value is to be attached to the supposed non-occurrence of a word outside the Greek Testament. But as to 'legio' or 'speculator,' why could not a Greek-speaking Jew pick up these words directly from the Romans as easily as one ignorant of Greek? 'Colonia,' found only in Acts xvi. 12, is said to be borrowed from the

Aramaic, as if forsooth even a Jew, not to say a Gentile (as the author of the Acts was) residing for a time in a Roman colony, could not know or use the word except through Aramaic. Can anything be added to this absurdity? Yes, there is one thing more; there is absolutely no proof that these words were in use in Aramaic before the Gospels and Acts were written. Mr. Neubauer does not include these Latin words in his list. The only expression that seems to us of any weight in the question is μαρὰν δθά which curiously enough occurs in an epistle to Greeks in Europe. It may perhaps be compared to our use of 'Kyrie eleison.' There is, however, nothing to connect it with the Jews of Palestine.

The postulate that the Gospels are translations whether in whole or in part is sufficiently bold. Three of them are on all sides admitted to have been written in Greek; and as to the first Gospel, even those who accept the tradition that St. Matthew wrote originally in Hebrew, yet generally feel compelled to admit that the existing gospel which bears his name is not a translation. Indeed this may be regarded as proved by the language of Jerome, the only one of our authorities who had seen or could read the supposed original. And if, as is usually held, the Epistle of St. James was written in Greek, this is a most weighty circumstance, since St. James appears never to have left Jerusalem. Bishop Wordsworth, indeed, in an essay in the present volume suggests the theory that this epistle was originally written in Aramaic, and reminds us that a similar hypothesis has been maintained with respect to the Epistle to the Hebrews. It would be of more consequence, however, if he could state that this hypothesis had been accepted, instead of being generally rejected. But now if the first gospel (to say nothing of the others) and one or two important epistles had been written in Aramaic, we have to answer the question, 'How was it that the Syrian churches in the second century entirely neglected or forgot these originals, and adopted into their Canon translations from the Greek?' The fact that some of the Apocryphal books were originally written in Hebrew appears rather unfavourable than otherwise to Prof. Neubauer's view. For the early and complete loss of the originals shows that, although the writers preferred to use Hebrew (or Aramaic), the readers preferred Greek.

Mr. Neubauer names Bernhardy as stating that the Greek spoken by the Asiatic peoples was a mere jargon. He has apparently bor-

rowed the reference from Böhl, who cites Bernhardy's *Grundriss der [zur Böhl] Griechischen Litteratur*, p. 492 (fourth edition, p. 505). Bernhardy's remark in the place cited has no reference to Palestine, for his judgment about which he remits his reader to another place. Speaking in p. 492 of the spread of Hellenic speech after Alexander's conquests from Asia Minor even as far as the interior of the Persian empire, where hitherto few colonies existed, but where there was now a complete military occupation, he quotes Niebuhr (*Kleine philol. Schriften*, ii. 198), to the effect that where whole masses adopt the language of their rulers, they do so in the form easiest in themselves and thus arises a 'jargon.' His observations about Palestine are on p. 519 (533, fourth edition) where he says that although for a long period

since Antiochus Epiphanes Palestine had been filled with a Greek population [differing in this from the places spoken of before], it was not till the time of Herod that a taste was acquired for Greek and Roman culture, adding that it is clear from passages in Rabbinical writers cited by Tholuck (*Brief an d. Hebräer*, 1850, p. 113 ff.): 'dass Griechisch als feine Sprache des Umgangs galt; die Gelehrten kannten diese Sprache, schätzten sie sogar vor dem Aramäischen.' It is on the whole clear that the arguments of Pfannkuche and Mr. Neubauer require sifting and revision before they can produce conviction. The reader would find it interesting to compare their reasoning with that of Dr. Roberts in his *Discussions on the Gospels*, 2nd ed., 1864.

T. K. ABBOTT.

THE CONDITIONAL SENTENCE IN LATIN.

PROF. SONNENSCHEIN's paper in the last number of the *Classical Review* seems to call for some remarks from the inculpated grammarians. I am partially absolved in a note, but still have something to say on the points brought forward.

I agree with the writer on the first two points:—that is to say, I hold that the Indicative in the protasis of a Conditional sentence does not imply reality, and that the Present Subjunctive in the protasis does not imply possibility. I long ago spoke so definitely on this matter in the preface to my *Grammar*, ii. pp. xcix, c., and in (the passage quoted by the Professor) § 1497 that I can only express my pleasure at our having come to the same view. But when he speaks of the Present Subjunctive in such sentences as expressing 'so natural an idea as a supposition referring to the future and accompanied by reserve,' I think he forgets that 'reserve' is really expressed by the use of a conditional particle. The difference between *si hoc dicas, erras* and *si hoc dicis, erres* is that the Indicative leaves it undecided whether 'you are saying it' or not, the Subjunctive marks at once that 'you are not saying it.' The Subjunctive implies thought as opposed to fact, and in such sentences by a secondary contrast it implies *not fact*. Neither Subjunctive nor Indicative implies any anticipation of future action, or any further caution or reserve than is inherent in every Conditional sentence.

The third opinion which Prof. Sonnenschein combats is 'that the Imperfect Subjunctive refers primarily to the past.' If he had said that it does not refer to the future (except, in reported speech, to the relatively future) I should have agreed with him: and much that he says might be used in support of this second proposition. I believe *si hoc diceret erraret* is often supposed to correspond to our English 'if he should say this, he would be wrong,' and to the ordinary use of the Greek Optative, and I agree with Prof. Sonnenschein in holding this view to be wrong. But his own proposition is more doubtful. He appears to me to confound two very different things—an equal number of instances and an equal legitimacy of use. I agree that in the majority of instances the Imperfect Subjunctive in the protasis (and I add in the apodosis also) of Conditional sentences refers to what he calls present time, but except in this statistical sense I do not think that it 'refers primarily' to the present.

The fact is, present time is a mere limit between past and future (see my § 1455), and has no duration of itself. The grammarian may say with the moralist, *fugit hora: hoc quod loquor inde est*. The Imperfect Subjunctive is used in these sentences, when you contemplate the present as the resultant of the past, and the Present Subjunctive is used when you contemplate the

present as the starting point of the future. But the Imperfect is also in conditional, as well as in other, sentences used of a continuous state, contemporaneous with some past action or time; and this use is every bit as good Latin as its use of the present time. I never dreamt of implying, as Prof. Sonnenschein seems to think, by my statement in § 1530 *c* that I 'put the reference to the present and to the past on the same footing' in point of frequency of use (I well knew the case to be otherwise), but I did mean to imply that they were both perfectly legitimate. And I can see nothing at all strange in Cicero's pointed expression *Nunc quemadmodum audiar sentio, at tunc si dicerem non audire* (Cic. *Clu.* 29, § 80). I do not know Priem's paper to which Prof. Sonnenschein refers, but I find in Etzler (*Sprach-Erörterungen*, 1826, p. 189) sufficient instances from one book of Cicero to prove all that I want. See *Verr.* iii. § 32 *faceres... posset*; 65 *fieret... concederes*; 115 *ageretur... postularent*; 129 *perpetere... pertinenter*. Where there is nothing illogical or unnatural in the use, a few instances from a writer like Cicero are sufficient to establish its correctness. Murder does not cease to be a crime because it is less frequent than theft.

Such translations as *si hoc faceret, erraret* 'if he had been doing this, he would have been erring,' are no doubt awkward, but they are used simply for technical purposes to point out the difference between Latin Imperfects and Pluperfects. 'Had he done this, he would be wrong' is better English. 'If he did this' would serve equally for *si faceret* and *si faciebat*, perhaps even for *si fecisset*. The first sentence quoted by Prof. Sonnenschein of an Imperfect 'where all reference to the past is absolutely excluded' (p. 128) *si iudex non essem, te potissimum petere oportaret*. (Cic. *Verr.* iv. § 70), I should

translate 'Had you not been judge, you would have been the very man to be plaintiff.' The English idiom has exactly the same ambiguity as the Latin Imperfect Subjunctive. Nor need I confine it to the Subjunctive. Cf. *Longam erat, &c.*, my *Grammar*, § 1535.

There is some danger in looking, as Prof. Sonnenschein tries to do (p. 124), exclusively at the protasis. The protasis after all is only a dependent sentence—grammatically, though not logically, dependent on the apodosis, and consequently, so far as the two are correlated, liable to be affected by its principal. I have found this consideration useful in classifying conditional usages, and venture to refer Prof. Sonnenschein in his 'further investigation' of some instances given on p. 127 to my §§ 1566—1570.

After what I have said above I will only say on Prof. Sonnenschein's fourth head that I have no hesitation in *not* referring to the future the instances he mentions at the end of his paper. But his reference to Madvig, § 347 *b* suggests to me to note here a curious vacillation in that great scholar's treatment of this question. In the first edition of his *Latin Grammar* we read 'Was jetzt oder in der Zukunft stattfinden würde, oder (gegen die Wirklichkeit) als stattfindend vorausgesetzt wird, wird durch das Imperfektum bezeichnet.' In the third edition (1857), which is obviously for many purposes still the standard, the words 'oder in der Zukunft' are left out. In the fourth and last ('improved and abridged') edition, 1867, he, as I think, wrongly reinserts these words, and omits all reference to the use of the Imperfect in reference to the past (note 2 to § 347, ed. 3). I have great difficulty in believing this reinsertion to have been deliberate.

H. J. ROBY.

SHORTER NOTICES.

Homeri Iliadis Carmina, edidit A. RZACH. Pars prior, 1886; pars altera, 1887. Mk. 1.25.

Homeri Odyssea. Scholarum in usum edidit P. CAUER. Pars prior, 1886, Mk. 1.20; pars altera, 1887, Mk. 1.20.

Homeri Hymni Epigrammata Batrachomyomachia, edidit E. ABEL. 1887. Mk. 1.80.

RZACH and Cauer are entirely dependent upon La Roche for the MSS., as every editor must be until the new critical edition by Ludwich, which I am glad to see that Cauer promises in his preface, sets

the diplomatic evidence on a firm basis. Both editors give texts which embody the more certain results of recent criticism. Both for instance write δησίον πτολέμαιον, ήδα for ήδω in the fifth foot, ήδος for ήδω as a trochee; but while Rzach has κώδιος with Nauck, Cauer retains κώδιος. Neither writes the *F*, but Rzach follows Nauck in omitting *v* ἐφελκυστικόν when followed by a word beginning with *F*, Cauer more consistently retains it. Rzach contents himself with a brief preface of a couple of pages, but Cauer has an interesting introduction explaining the principles which he has followed; attention may be

particularly called to his remarks on the vexed question of *ει* and *η* in forms like *θείης*, *θηῆς*. He follows Aristarchos in writing long *ε* as *η* in all cases before *ε* and *i* sounds, and before *ο* and *α* sounds when it comes from *α*; but as *ει* when it arises from *ε* and stands before *ο* and *α* sounds; thus *κατελογειν*, *επιθημειν*, *θηῆς*, *χέρεια*, *χέρειν*. He thus agrees with Mr. Monro (*Hom. Grammar* p. 318) in holding that 'the long vowel of E-stems, such as *θηῆς*, *δηῆν*, etc., was not originally the same sound as the Ionic *η* which represents older *ā*,' and that the two were differently affected by the phonetic influence of the following vowel.

Abel's edition of the Homeric hymns is a real advance, as it is a complete recension of the text based on much needed new collation of the MSS., and entirely supplants Baumeister's praiseworthy but now antiquated work. It thus stands side by side with Gemoll's excellent edition, which appeared almost simultaneously, but late enough for the addition of a critical appendix in which Abel's readings are recorded. Gemoll is thus fuller in his apparatus, as he not only incorporates Abel's work, but gives throughout the readings of the 'Paris class' of MSS. which Abel deliberately omits as worthless. Abel however is more convenient for practical use, at least for those who decline the aid of Gemoll's excellent and original commentary.—W. LEAF.

Der Dialekt der homerischen Gedichte: von Dr. J. VAN LEEUWEN, Jr. und M. B. MENDES DA COSTA, aus dem Holländischen übersetzt von Dr. E. MEHLER. Leipzig. Teubner. 1886. 8vo. pp. 158. Mk. 2.40.

THIS little book—the work of two Dutch scholars, now translated into German—gives a useful summary of Homeric accidence, with especial reference to the progress which has been made of late towards recovering the original forms of the dialect. This work, as is well known, may be, and has been, carried on in more than one way. We may approach it, with H. L. Ahrens and G. Curtius, from the vantage-ground of comparative Indo-European grammar; or we may confine ourselves, as Bekker did in the last generation, and as Cobet and Nauck still do, to the use of comparison within the field of the Greek language. The latter is the method chiefly followed in the book before us, the authors of which are thoroughly imbued with the spirit of Cobet's criticism, and inclined to look with some distrust upon facts which lie beyond a strictly Hellenic horizon. The two methods, indeed, do not necessarily come into conflict: for all true conclusions (as Aristotle said) are harmonious. The restoration of the digamma, to take the most prominent example, may be accomplished (1) by comparing Greek with other languages which have preserved a labial spirant: or (2) by studying the metrical facts of Homer. But neither process gives such complete and certain results that we can afford to be satisfied with it alone. And in any case it is unscientific not to avail ourselves to the full of two sources of evidence which by their entire independence are peculiarly fitted to correct and supplement each other.

A few examples will show the nature of the preference shown by our authors for purely Greek analogies.

1. The loss of the augment in Homer, they say (p. 68), must be regarded as aphaeresis; and accordingly in the example of a restored primitive text given at the end of the book they write *τείχει*, *καλέσαροι*, and so on. They add that the omission of the augment in such a verb as *ἄγε* can also 'perhaps' be regarded as an aphaeresis. This last kind of 'aphaeresis' is quite without parallel in Greek, or indeed in any language: yet it must be admitted unless the authors

consent to leave forms like *ἄγε* for *Ἄγε* out of their theory. But the real objection surely is that the use of forms without augment is common to the oldest Greek and the oldest Sanscrit.

2. The Perfects in *-ά* (-*φα* and *χα*) are said to be probably derived from those in *-κα*, by *k* passing into *h* (p. 80). No evidence is given of this phonetic change ever having taken place in Greek. The fact that Perfects in *-κα* appear earlier than those which aspirate a radical *π* or *κ* (giving *-φα*, *-χα*), is far from proving that the latter are to be derived from the former—at least this would be the opinion of students of comparative grammar.

3. The treatment of the form *δείδω* (p. 83) is an interesting example of conflict between the two methods. From a Greek point of view it seems to be present, and as such it stands alone, and deserves all the epithets, 'unheard of,' 'impossible,' 'inconceivable,' which are wont to be applied to an anomaly. On the other hand *δείδα*, which also occurs in our texts, is supported as perfectly by other forms, *δείδε*, *δείδην*, *δείδιασι*, *δείδιτε*, &c. Hence Cobet and Nauck unhesitatingly change *δείδω* into *δείδια*. But comparative grammarians point out that *δείδια* is not correctly formed from a root *δείδι*. The true form, as their more exact analysis shows, is *δείδιον*, which might become *δείδιον*, and so *δείδιω*, *δείδιον*. Accordingly, instead of turning *δείδω* into *δείδια* or *δείδιον*, they turn *δείδια* into *δείδιον* or *δείδιω*.

4. We may add to this list the assumption of such forms as *εFFaθε*, *εFFiθε* (for *εθαθε*, *εθαθε*). It may be too much to maintain that a double digamma is impossible; but certainly there is no trace of the corresponding labial of other languages, such as Latin or Sanscrit, being either pronounced or written as a double letter.

5. In the list of digammated words given by our authors (p. 28), we find *Faθpaw* and *Fas*. They have overlooked an interesting paper by L. Meyer (*K. Z.* xxiii. p. 49 ff.), in which he shows that *F* never remains in Homer before *ο* or *ω*. And in the case of these two forms the independent evidence of the *F* is of the slightest.

It will be understood that the objections on which we have been insisting apply rather to the school of philology which this book represents than to the work itself. Its merits, on the other hand, are of a solid and useful kind. Readers will find in it the best results of an important vein of enquiry—that which seeks to purify the Homeric text from the corruption and modernisation that it must have undergone during the centuries when written copies were few and diplomatic criticism had not begun. This is an inquiry which was set in motion by Bentley, and is evidently by no means exhausted.—D. B. MONRO.

The Metamorphoses of Ovid. Books XIII. and XIV.
Edited by CHARLES SIMMONS, M.A. Macmillan.
4s. 6d.

THIS is a scholarly edition of two of the books of the *Metamorphoses*, best suited for school reading. The introduction deals with the design of the poem, and justly dwells upon the consummate art with which Ovid has woven into one harmonious whole a web of stories entirely disconnected, save by the one recurring incident of a metamorphosis. Mr. Simmons has conscientiously studied most modern editions; though those of Loers (1843) and Magnus (1855) might have been consulted. The notes are marked by a good knowledge of the author, accuracy, and genuine poetic feeling; and are well calculated to stimulate interest. Particularly good are those on *invidiosus* (XIII. 414), the relation of *gener* and *socer* (*ib.* 509), Ovid's fondness for substantives in -*men* (*ib.* 778), and the Sibyl's

cave (XIV. 104). Grammatical points are often happily handled, *e.g.* *zeugma* (XIII. 632), and 'adjectival substantives' (XIV. 362); but the grammatical matter seems to me a trifle in excess. Thus the frequent illustration of Latin from Greek idiom is superfluous, and sometimes misleading, *e.g.* XIII. 508, *maxima rerum*, the gen. is partitive, and Conington's notion of a local gen. should not be revived; and the note on the coordinate relative with *infin.* (XIV. 226) is unnecessary, as the usage has not 'been neglected by the grammars,' see Madvig, § 402 *a* and *b*, Roby § 1781. Omissions are few, though *iamdudum* with *imperat.* = 'immediately' (XIII. 457), the rare *mi* for *mihi* (*ib.* 503, cp. IX. 191), and the almost certainly right reading *revulsum* (XIV. 181), might have been noticed. In the following places I differ from the editor: XIII. 114, *eur spoliervi erit* should not be translated, 'there will be cause for spoiling you,' for the preceding *quod* forms the subject; cp. *inf.* 527, F. iii. 629; XIII. 165, *arma* is surely simply the shield and spear brought by Ulysses; XIII. 277, *nonus in officio* = 'ninth in offering his service,' not 'in loyalty'; XIII. 338, *conferat* is not hypothetical but deliberative; XIII. 356, *moderatio Ajax* = not 'a wiser' but 'the less presumptuous Ajax'; XIII. 451, *plus quam femina virgo*, 'virgo' expresses the age [were there then no old maid?] *femina* the sex.' Rather, the offering demanded was not merely a woman, but the maiden Polyxena; XIII. 718, *subiectis pennis* means not 'sudden (new-created) wings,' but 'wings put beneath,' *i.e.* attached to them; XIV. 133, the indirect *patuisset* = a direct fut. pf. indic., and similarly line 141, *paterer* = a fut. simple in direct speech; *carina* may have originally meant 'hull' (XIV. 534), but surely it means 'keel' in XIV. 552, 'mediisque carina sublata navigis spiniae mutatur in usum'; Cyclop is incorrectly printed for Cyclops (pp. 31, 47, 158, 162, 167). What authority is there for naming Ovid's friend *M. Junius Brutus* (p. xi.)?

But, leaving these *minutiae*, the work as a whole is excellent, and strongly to be recommended. A most interesting feature is a number of remarks, mainly critical, by Mr. R. Ellis, in which he quotes the readings of four Bodleian MSS. Of these the best is Can. 7, which often preserves the right reading where the Marcianus is wrong. Mr. Ellis contributes many acute conjectures; the best perhaps are *timidi haut audacis* (XIV. 671), and *est locus ulterius* (XIV. 489); but *Clariss subit, hieque* (XIV. 612) seems to me open to doubt on grounds of euphony; see Madvig on *de Fin.* v. 40, Haupt, *Opusc.* iii. 510.

S. G. OWEN.

Éléments de Grammaire Latine (d'après Lhomond),
par GEORGES ÉDON, Paris: Belin, 1886, 16th
edition. 360 pp., small 8vo. 2 frs.

THE name of Lhomond has an old world ring about it, and from a book which 'demeure entièrement conforme au plan de Lhomond' one must not expect modern ideas on the teaching of grammar. 'Si vient l'indicatif devant le présent et le parfait; le subjonctif devant l'imparfait et le plus-que-parfait.' 'Le régime du verbe passif se met à l'ablatif avec *a* ou *ab*, *quand'* etc. The term *Que retranché* for accusative with the infinitive, which has died so hard in France, is in this edition at last given up with a sigh of regret in favour of *Proposition Infinitive*. The rubric 'Mots interrogatifs entre deux verbes' only partially gives place to *Interrogation Indirecte*. In a word, there is no trace of an attempt to base Syntax on the analysis of the sentence, or to insist on an intelligent grasp of principle. The method is purely empirical. On the other hand the

book has merits of a practical kind. The construction of impersonal verbs, for instance, may be found without hunting through all the cases. In general the arrangement may be said to aim at following the order of a French pupil's ideas. The Accidence is laudably unencumbered with philology. 'Nous nous sommes bien gardés de compliquer l'étude de la déclinaison et de la conjugaison latines, pour la satisfaction toute gratuite d'en faire une exposition plus savante.' In the third declension we find, instead of the monstrous array of paradigms given in some English grammars, only three—*soror, corpus, avis*: two more (*securis, cubile*) are added in a *Supplément aux Déclinaisons*, which forms part of the body of the book. Better examples might have been perhaps chosen, but the limitation of number is entirely commendable. *Accipio* is conjugated in full. The treatment of verb-nouns is unsatisfactory, but in accordance with French practice: 'En avec le participe présent veut le verbe latin au gérondif en *do*.' Following the Syntax is a third part—*Méthode pour exprimer les Gallicismes*: a fourth part gives a short sketch of Metre, Prosody and Accentuation.—E. A. S.

Grammaire Latine par SALOMON REINACH, Paris; Delagrave; 1886. 358 pp., large 8vo. 5 frs.

THE author has aimed at producing a grammar more suitable for schools and colleges than what he calls the 'dictionnaires grammaticaux' of Guardia-Wierczyski and Madvig (Theil's translation)—the only books hitherto available for advanced pupils in France. To treat grammar in a manner 'à la fois élémentaire et scientifique' is an exceedingly difficult task; and the author has done well to put his science and his elementary instruction in different parts of his book. An Appendix discusses such questions as 'Place du Latin dans la famille Aryenne,' 'Phonétique Latine,' 'Théorie comparée de la Déclinaison,' etc., and shows that the author is fully abreast of modern philological science; in the body of the book he has wisely decided to be practical. In the declension of nouns we hear nothing about vowel and consonant stems; the terminations are added to the radical or *thème*—a form obtained by rejecting the termination of the Genitive Singular.

That this is the best way of treating the subject for beginners appears to be the result at which experienced teachers in Germany too have generally arrived. The verbal forms are divided thus: *am-o, am-abam, am-avi, am-aturus*. Here the author distinctly goes too far. It is really more practical, as well as more correct, to recognise three themes as a basis of the verb forms: *leg-, tēg-, lect-*. Would it not be also more practical to follow the Germans in discarding the time-honoured *amo* in favour of some verb like *laudo*, which admits of sharper distinction of meaning between its imperfect and perfect tenses? It is strange that in England *amabam* with its meaningless translation 'I was loving' should have kept its place so long.

The Syntax is based on a plan which the author owes to Thurot, his former teacher. It is introduced by a 'Coup d'œil sur la Syntaxe,'—a brief *résumé* of elementary rules for turning French into Latin. Then follow I. Syntaxe de Co-ordination, II. Syntaxe de Subordination. Under the first head are treated the Concord, Cases, the Adjective, the Pronoun, (including, strangely, the Relative), the Adverb, Voices, and Tenses, together with a few words on Moods. Under the second head comes Thurot's classification of 'Propositions' as A. Indépendantes (*Indicatives, Volitives, Optatives, Délitratives, Problématiques, Concessives, Désiratives*); B. Dépendantes (*Complétives* *i.e.* clauses introduced by *ut, ne, quoniam, quin*, and dependent questions; *Causales*,

Finales, Convénitives, Suppositives, Concessives, Comparatives, Temporelles, Relatives). A chapter on the Infinitive (*Proposition Infinitive*) follows. In this arrangement one recognises a sound principle—that Syntax should be based on a classification of sentences: whether the scheme of analysis adopted is the best possible may be open to doubt. But in general this part of the book deserves considerable praise, as an attempt to introduce into France a rational system of Syntax-teaching.

I append a few criticisms on miscellaneous points. The Optative in Greek is declared in a note to be nothing but an historical subjunctive. This doctrine should not be asserted without noticing that the Optative corresponds in usage quite as much to the present as to the imperfect subj. of Latin. Modern science recognises two distinct moods for Greek (see Brugmann in Iwan Müller).—*Dies me deficit* is not synonymous, as an apodosis, with *Dies me deficit*.—The interpretation of *Aen.* IX. 288 *Inque salutatum linguo (nox et tua dextera testis) quod nequeam lacrimas perferre parentis* which is assigned to Thurot, that *quod nequeam* ('je serais incapable') depends on *linguo* is not new, (Conington after Madvig).—Is it really a good thing for French boys to learn gender rules in German? The author has adopted the verses of Zumpt entire. His readers will be inclined to think the French language capable of such lyrical flights as

Commune heisst was einen Manu
Und eine Frau bedeuten kann.

E. A. SONNENSCHEIN.

Syntaxe Latine par O. RIEMANN, viii. and 496 pp.
Paris: Klincksieck. 4 frs.

THERE is no doubt of the author's competence to write a Latin Syntax. His 'Studies on the language and grammar of Livy,' prove that to any one who is acquainted with them. The same excellent scholarship is seen in this little book. There is much careful discrimination of the usage of particular authors and clear and full statement (with references to the particular passages) of the facts of Latin construction. But the method of exposition is somewhat defective. It is largely built on a comparison of the French and Latin text or idiom. There is no clearly visible and firm skeleton in the treatise. Little attempt is made to arrange, for instance, the usages of the subjunctive under leading conceptions and show their descent and collateral affinities. There are of course many differences among grammarians, but two main schools may be distinguished, those which take their cue from the forms, and those which take it from some abstract classification of the meaning. The former (*e.g.* Madvig) look to the case and to the mood for their points of grouping: the latter to the character of the qualification or of the sentence. As regards the treatment of case the former has generally prevailed: as regards the sentence the latter school (*e.g.* Kühner) is perhaps yet predominant. M. Riemann belongs to the latter, and so far I differ from him; and still more when he puts, *e.g.* as coordinate divisions the indicative, the potential (present and perfect subjunctive) and the 'mode irréel' (imperfect and pluperfect subjunctive). I have not noticed any special novelty of an important character, but some old errors, as I regard them, continue. *E.g.* he classes under one general head such very different datives as those in *locum castris capere* and *venire auxilio*; he has a vague dative of 'relation' which contains *oppidum primum est uenientibus ab Epiro* and *id remedium timori fuit*. *Dicat (dixerit) aliquis* appears as potential without question of the frequency of the former or of the mood of the latter. Again

the historical infinitive receives no further explanation than that it is used to replace in narrations the imperfect indicative: and the gerund (gérondif) and verbal adjective in *-ndus* are treated together without any attempt to account for their parallelism. In the passages of Caesar which M. Riemann as well as myself and others have converted into *oral. recto*, he has mistaken (as I once did) the meaning of *impune injurias tulisse* (B. G. i. 14, § 4) which is not 'suffered wrongs' but 'bore off' *i.e.* 'committed wrongs' (p. 343). I gladly add that the book is otherwise very accurate.

H. J. R.

DICTIONNAIRE DES ANTIQUITÉS GRECQUES ET ROMAINES d'après les textes et les monuments, contenant l'explication des termes qui se rapportent aux mœurs, aux institutions, à la religion, aux arts, aux sciences, au costume, au mobilier, à la guerre, à la marine, aux métiers, aux monnaies, poids et mesures, etc. etc., et en général à la vie publique et privée des anciens. Ouvrage rédigé par une société d'écrivains spéciaux, d'archéologues et de professeurs, sous la direction de MM. CH. DAREMBERG et EDM. SAGLIO, avec 3000 figures d'après l'antique, dessinées par P. Sellier et gravées par M. Rapine. Paris: Hachette. 1873-1887. Vol. I pt. 1 A. B. pp. 1-756. pt. 2 C. pp. 757-1703, large 4to (same size as Littré's French Dictionary, issued by the same firm). Each part 5 frs.

THE enterprising publishers, to whom we owe the magnificent editions of Duruy's History of the Greeks and History of the Romans, the History of Art in Antiquity by G. Perrot and Ch. Chipiez, and an excellent series of annotated editions of Greek and Latin classics, present the learned world in this stately quarto with a work worthy of the country of Saumaise, Hérault, and Montfaucon. No other nation as yet possesses anything approaching to it in beauty and completeness; it is absolutely necessary to every classical library and to every public library frequented by scholars or artists.

When the first *fascicule* (pr. 5 fr., containing 20 sheets of text and 189 engravings) appeared, it was hoped that three or four *fascicules* might appear in a year, and five or six years bring the work to completion. M. Renier, when offering to the Academy of Inscriptions, on 20 June, 1873, the first part, stated that the work had been set on foot, by Daremberg, twelve years before. Abbé Martigny's well-known Dictionary of Christian Antiquities was originally intended to form part of Daremberg's collection.

Among many criticisms, by competent judges, printed on the covers of successive parts, one, by A. Dumont, explains and excuses the slowness of publication: 'il a tout revu (he is speaking of M. Saglio), tout relu, vérifié ces milliers de notes, refondu un grand nombre d'articles pour assurer l'unité de l'ouvrage, sans compter tous ceux qui sont restés son œuvre exclusive.'

Many topics omitted in Smith's and Rich's dictionaries, find a place here, as mythology. The article *Alphabetum* by Lenormant is (as many others are) a complete treatise, occupying 30 pages, and illustrated by 11 plates. References, always at the foot of the page, are attached to each statement of the text, and a bibliography concludes each article. The writers are evidently masters of the literature of their subjects, and references are in general precise and made to the latest editions. Criticism of details would be out of place in dealing in a few lines with a work of vast labour; we would rather congratulate the editor and publishers on the acceleration of their pace (No. 6 appeared in 1879, No. 7 in 1880, No. 8 in 1882,

No. 9 in 1884, No. 10 in 1886, No. 11 completing the letter C and vol. 1 in this year), and purchasers on being able at last to bind the book. If future volumes are limited to about 800 pages, they will not remain, as vol. 1 has done, for fourteen years in drawers and cupboards. For one raid that has hitherto been made on this great storehouse of ancient learning, a hundred will be made in future.

J. E. B. M.

Monuments of Classical Antiquity (Denkmäler des Klassischen Altertums zur Erläuterung des Lebens der Griechen und Römer), edited by A. BAUMEISTER. Munich and Leipzig. 1884-87. Vol. I. 26 Mk.

THIS work, which has been little noticed, if at all, in English periodicals, has now reached its 37th part and the article 'Phigalia.' It will be convenient to deal here with parts 1-21 which constitute volume I. and contain the letters A—I. In the absence of any satisfactory Dictionary of Classical Antiquities the appearance of the work is of rather exceptional importance. The *Dictionnaire des Antiquités* of Daremberg and Saglio is indeed an excellent and elaborate book, but though begun in 1873 it has only reached the letter D. The new edition of Smith's *Dictionary of Antiquities* is not likely to be ready for some time, and revised editions of Dr. Smith's other Classical Dictionaries are not even in contemplation. Baumeister's *Monuments* is not, and apparently does not claim to be, a complete Dictionary of Antiquities, but it is so rapidly nearing completion, and its articles (which are lexicographically arranged) deal with so many subjects, that the archaeologist naturally turns to it as a tolerable substitute for a dictionary.

The great feature of the book is the illustrations. The idea seems to have been to bring together in a work of moderate extent and cost reproductions, accompanied by a series of articles, of all the more important ancient monuments that illustrate the Religion, Art and Custom of the Greeks and Romans. The text, though it does not often degenerate into mere 'writing to pictures,' hardly attempts to be exhaustive, for in many cases subjects are dealt with only from the artistic and archaeological standpoints, little reference being made to the information derivable from the literary sources. There is no systematic indication of Bibliography (as there is in Daremberg and Saglio), though most of the articles incidentally furnish a good many references to the literature of the subjects discussed. As a complete bibliography has not been aimed at, it is perhaps hardly necessary to record here such omissions as I have discovered, for instance in the article 'Abraxas' (on Gnostic Gems), where there is a reference to Matter and to an essay by Bellermann, but not to Mr. King's book; and in the article on River-gods ('Flussgötter') where no notice is taken of an important dissertation by Prof. Percy Gardner. Perhaps also the reader may legitimately complain that he is rather too frequently 'sent on' to complete his bibliographical researches in 'Marquardt' and 'Becker-Göll.'

Certain defects in the work appear to arise from an attempt to cover too much ground and, perhaps, from its limits not having been very clearly defined beforehand. The Editor not only admits many of the subjects usually found in Dictionaries of Antiquities but includes Mythology and Iconography, and, at a pinch, Geography and Biography. Besides dissertations on ancient art and custom we find articles on divinities, heroes and mythical person-

ages; articles on the portraiture of emperors, statesmen and poets; an article, mainly topographical, on the city of Athens, and even biographies of the minor sculptors. The Editor seems never to have quite set aside the notion of making his book a complete Dictionary of Antiquities, for he has admitted several articles which are not, and could not well be, illustrated by 'Denkmäler.' Thus, we find short dissertations on Banks and Bankers, on the use of Iron and the Exposing of Children. An almost inevitable result of attempting so much is that several of the articles are too brief and superficial to be of much practical usefulness to students. At the same time, there are in the work many articles of which the solid merit cannot be denied, and one feels grateful for a book that contains so much information not readily accessible elsewhere. The illustrated part of the work is, on the whole, satisfactorily carried out. Many of the monuments, especially the more important works in sculpture, are reproduced by photography. There are numerous engravings and some illustrations in colour. The form of the book is convenient, and the printing and paper are good, thus forming a pleasant contrast to the Lexicons of Roscher and Pauly. Even the archaeologist who has a good library at his command will find Baumeister's 'Monuments' a handy book to cite and to turn to for reference. To ordinary students of Classical Literature and Art who cannot afford and who have no inclination to get together the numerous and costly books which constitute an archaeological library this work may be cordially recommended. Each part costs 1s., which considering the ordinary price of such illustrated books is reasonable.

Among the more elaborate articles in the book may be noted 'Athens' by Dr. Milchöfer; 'Architecture' ('Baukunst'), 'Sculpture' ('Bildhauerkunst'), 'Erechtheion' and 'Etruscan Antiquities' ('Etrurien') by Dr. Julius; 'Chorus' and 'Choregia' by Dr. B. Arnold; 'Siege-operations' ('Festungskrieg und Geschützwesen') by Dr. A. Müller; 'Flutes and Wind-organs' ('Flöten') by Dr. K. Von Jan; and 'Ilias' and 'Iliopersis' by the Editor.

The mythological articles have been undertaken by Dr. Baumeister himself. This task was, perhaps, almost too much for one man—and that man the editor of a dictionary—to accomplish in an entirely satisfactory manner. Some of the articles (for instance that on Antinoos), might certainly have been worked out more thoroughly: others, however, are fairly elaborate and painstaking. In point of fulness and learning the mythological part of this book cannot compare with Roscher's new Lexicon, though in the number and excellence of its illustrations as well as in its typographical arrangements Baumeister is decidedly ahead of Roscher. There are a few articles which might have been more liberally supplied with illustrations: 'Aphrodite,' 'Erinyen' (which is not illustrated at all), 'Europe,' 'Baumkultus,' 'Flussgötter.' The iconographical articles are interesting and useful, though it is to be regretted that the portrait-coins have been reproduced by engraving and not by photography. Numismatic wood-cutters almost invariably fail to catch likenesses, and Dr. Baumeister's eminent hands are no exception to the rule. Perhaps it might be found possible before the work is completed to furnish the reader with a series of portrait-coins of emperors reproduced by some photographic process. Some of the Greek Imperial coins with heads should also have been reproduced by photography: the engraving, for instance, of the coin of Mitylene accompanying the article 'Alkaios' is poor and misleading. 'Alexander the Great' is well illustrated by photographs, though,

strangely enough, there is no reproduction of his head as it appears on the coins of Lysimachus. With these exceptions, however, the work is well and fully illustrated. Under 'Sculpture' ('Bildhauerkunst') a long series of important monuments is reproduced, and many of the shorter articles are accompanied by interesting illustrations. Thus, under 'Barber' there is a photograph of the quaint terra-cotta group at Berlin of an ancient hair-dresser operating upon his subject. As I have already stated, there are few antiquarian topics which are not treated of in this work; it may be noted however that there is no article 'Contorniates,' and a separate article on 'Hygieia' as well as portrait-coins of Allectus and Carausius might have been included with advantage.

An ideal criticism of so comprehensive a work as Dr. Baumeister's could only be penned by a writer of encyclopaedic knowledge having unlimited columns of the *Classical Review* at his disposal. The present article has, however, I hope indicated with tolerable fairness the principal merits and defects of the first volume of the work. I may perhaps add that my opinion has been formed not only after reading through a large number of the articles, but also after having frequently consulted the book for information on the very numerous and varied 'points' that have to be looked up by one engaged in the study of Greek and Roman Numismatics.

W. WROTH.

Physikalische Geographie von Griechenland—NEUMANN und PARTSCH, Koobner, Breslau, 1885. 9 Mk.

THE Universities of Oxford and Cambridge have recently determined, at the suggestion of the Geographical Society, to establish Readerships in Geography. To all who are interested in this decision I would commend Neumann and Partsch's book as an example of the kind of work which such Readers might do with advantage.

Dr. Partsch has completed and brought up to date the important treatise on the physical geography of Greece which was the work of his teacher and predecessor, Dr. Neumann. The scheme of the book, and the leading ideas belong to Neumann; but his pupil deserves immense credit for the conscientious labour which he has devoted to its completion in detail. This is not one of those airy handbooks which give you a little art, a little history and a few commonplaces about the effect of climate upon the temper. It is a serious work, a perfect mine of facts and references; a mine, too, of ideas. Its aim is stated by Neumann in his admirable introduction to be the systematic exhibition of the physical features of Greece and their influence upon national character and institutions in ancient times. The definiteness and moderation with which he lays down the limits of his subject contrast strongly with the vague and ill-proportioned claims by which Buckle and other writers have made the name of physical environment unpopular in England. The body of the book is divided into five chapters, dealing with the climate of Greece, the relation of land and sea, the conformation of the land, its geology, and its vegetation. In the last two chapters, which form rather more than half the book, the classical reader will be chiefly interested in the sections that describe the influence of limestone rocks upon the worship of Poseidon, and of the connection between the cultivation of corn and the festivals of Athene. It appears that the cultus of Poseidon is only found in districts which are distinguished either by the presence of *barathra* or by the frequent occurrence of earthquakes.

But it is not only in these chapters that light is thrown upon myths and religious ceremonies. Researches of that kind form one of the most interesting features of the book; and their inductive method and moderate tone make them convincing as well as agreeable reading.

Another valuable part of the book is the analysis of the mountain system. No one who has not made a study of Greek geography can realise the difficulties of getting a clear conception of the structure of Aetolia and Arcadia. No existing map (not even the Vienna map) throws much light upon it: most of them represent it as mere confusion. But the third chapter of this book makes the reader feel that there is order in the seeming chaos, and that a map might show it. The same chapter states with admirable clearness and impartiality the political results of the country's peculiar formation. It contains little that is absolutely new: but its completeness and philosophical tone may make it welcome as a compendium even to those who are familiar with its doctrines.

But the book has one serious fault. It is undeniably dull, both in style and in arrangement. Gratitude for much information cannot blind the reader to the fact that a catalogue of trees which fills a hundred pages is excessive when thirty are found sufficient for the mountains. And catalogues are too prominent in other parts; while those single instances, by which many writers at once relieve and illustrate a long argument, are strangely wanting. Dr. Neumann's style is clear and often forcible, but it lacks brightness and variety. Dr. Partsch is neither clear nor forcible. And neither style gains by the arrangement which presents them in a kind of irregular sandwich. But, despite its faults, this is a book which no student of Greek history can afford to neglect.

M. G. GLAZEBROOK.

The Story of the Nations: Alexander's Empire. By J. P. MAHAFFY, D.D. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 5s.

EVEN if this book were much less cleverly put together than it is, it would be impossible for a critic to withhold his sympathy from the author. He has undertaken to write a story without a plot, and with hardly any unity of scene or of national character. He repeatedly betrays his own discomfort under these trying circumstances, by explaining and apologising for omissions and curtailments. He has to tell something reluctantly of wars and quarrels which carry little human interest with them, and lead only to results which were soon in their turn obliterated; and he has to cut short chapters evidently written *en amore*, where his wide reading and great knowledge of antiquity must have often tempted him to pause and talk at leisure to his readers. His progress through the two centuries that followed Alexander's conquests must have been a somewhat dreary one, and we seem to see signs in the latter part of the book that he was glad to get to the end of it.

It may be useful to give a brief indication of the contents of a book which in 300 pages covers so long and complicated a period of history. The story of Alexander's conquests is compressed into forty pages, with plans of his three great battles; brief as the account is, it is full of suggestive comment, and the only thing wanting seems to be some explanation of the way in which the notion of a great attack on Persia, which originated in Greece, was transferred to Philip, and through him to Alexander; Isokrates is not even mentioned. Seven chapters follow, on the period of the Diadochi, and these are some of the best in the book. The two figures of greatest human interest,

Demetrius and Eumenes, are handled (the former especially), with due appreciation of the importance of their lives by Plutarch; we have two or three interesting pages upon Hellenistic city life, and wish for more, for we do not learn anything about the method of government of these cities, nor does the author make it clear to us (see p. 95), whether he agrees with Droysen or Grote as to the number of foundations attributed to Alexander and his successors. A brief sketch of the philosophy of this period, given in chapter xi., is written in Dr. Mahaffy's most lively and original style, and the strange contrast of Aristotle's political thinking and his great pupil's political actions is skilfully touched. Leaving the Diadochi, the author faces the most difficult part of his task with surprising coolness, and the chapter on 'the three young kings' is a model of the art of marshalling complicated facts in a very short space; it is followed by a valuable chapter, one of those which must have greatly tempted its writer to give himself rein, on the *litterati* and scientists of Alexandria. Thence we pass to the further history of the three great kingdoms, to the age of the Achaean League, the reign of Philip V., and the first interference of Rome in Greece and the East, where the young reader will find himself once more on ground with which he is tolerably familiar. In this last part of the book it must be confessed that even Dr. Mahaffy has not always been able to make the narrative perfectly lucid or really interesting; but he has probably done all that could well be done in the space allowed him. The chapters on Pergamon and Rhodes, and on the influence of Hellenism on Rome, contribute some relief to the rapid narrative of events.

The book is copiously illustrated with maps, and cuts of statues and coins; and the only real blemish I have found is on p. 50, where a strange blunder has been committed which the author must have already noticed. It is all the more to be regretted that we are occasionally offended by faults of taste, which betray a tendency to loose historical thinking, and a desire to make the book readable by means which a judicious writer would on second thoughts reject.

W. W. FOWLER.

AESCHYL. *Agam.* 301.

πλέον καίνοτα τῶν εἰρημένων.

Mr. Paley translates the words τῶν εἰρημένων 'than those hitherto described.' Others have thought the line in some way corrupt. But why may it not mean 'than what had been commanded?' τὰ εἰρημένα is found in this sense in Soph. *Antig.* 215 ὡς ἀν σκοτοῦ νῦν ήτε τῶν εἰρημένων. The poet, wishing to describe the eagerness with which the watchmen carried out their orders in transmitting the glad intelligence by means of a fire, says that they kindled a bigger fire than had been ordered.—ALEX. PALLIS.

ARIST. *Ach.* 100. The following note has been communicated to me: 'That the words of the ambassador must belong to some real language has been recognised by most scholars; we should have expected them to be Old Persian, but the attempts at explaining them from that language by the eminent authorities Brockhaus and Spiegel (see W. Ribbeck's edition) are obvious failures. I do not know whether it has been noticed that the verse with (practically) no alterations will translate as old Sanskrit; we may thus transliterate

ιαρταμαν εξαρκαν απιστονα σαρα

(the reading of most MSS., see A. Müller's note)
iyarti māñ xarxā na piçuna satrā

The Story of the Nations: Carthage. By Professor A. J. CHURCH. T. Fisher Unwin. 5s.

PROFESSOR CHURCH has used his story-telling powers to great advantage in this excellent little book. It is a melancholy tale of continuous defeat and disaster, but by going to the original authorities, and selecting from them what best suits his purpose, he has contrived to make it really interesting. Even an unpretentious book, written for young readers, gains greatly by being the work of a scholar; and this one has also the advantage of numerous cuts of Carthaginian coins and monuments, together with plans of Carthage, Utica, &c. and a rough but pleasant-looking map of the Carthaginian empire. A good map of Sicily might well have been added.

The author has wisely broken the long record of the campaigns which constitute almost all we know of Carthaginian history by three short but useful and interesting chapters on the discoveries, the constitution, and the trade of Carthage, the first of which contains a translation, with geographical notes, of the *Periplus* of Hanno. In the second, as indeed throughout the book, he has carefully steered clear of all controversy, in order to give as clear an outline as possible of the really salient facts. This is by no means an easy matter, in a history bristling, like that of Carthage, with points of doubt and controversy; but the result is quite successful. Incidentally it is interesting to note that Professor Church (in spite of Mommsen) accepts the date 509 B.C. for the first treaty with Rome, following Polybius, for whom he evidently has a great liking; that he takes Hannibal over the Alps by the Little St. Bernard, and has not become a convert to Mr. Freshfield, and the Duranthe theory (here again he follows Polybius rather than Livy); and that he places the battle-field of Trasumenes (rightly perhaps) to the west of the long defile under the hills.

The book may be heartily recommended to readers of all orders and ages. It brings together in a single volume of 300 pages some of the most vital and interesting events in the history of Phoenicians, Greeks, and Romans, and tells the story of them with much skill in arrangement, and in perfectly simple language.

W. W. F.

NOTES.

'mittit me Xerxes, o scelerate, nequaquam.' Each of these words, with the exception of *xarxā* (a proper name), may be verified with the aid of Grassmann's Concordance from the Rig-Veda:

iyarti, Gr. col. 99.

piçuna, Gr. col. 819; frequent in later Sanskrit.

na-satrā, 'not at all,' Gr. col. 1454; na vindāmi

satrā, 'I can by no means find!'

Vespae 355. μέμνησα δῆθ' ὅτι ἐπὶ στρατιᾶς κλέψας ποτὲ τοὺς ὀβελίσκους

τεις σαυτὸν κατὰ τοῦ τείχους.

On the nature of these ὀβελίσκοι and the object of stealing them, the commentators (Richter, Mitchell, Green) offer no suggestions; Voss (1821) renders the word by 'Bratspiesschen.' Müller-Strübing, A.H.K. p. 615, 599, notices the difficulty and suggests ὀβελίτας, a reading apparently represented by the 'Spießkuchen' of Droysen, ed. 3.—I am inclined to think that a passage of Diodorus (xix, 45, 4) may throw some light on the passage in the *Vespae*: εὐδὺς (at the flooding of Rhodes) τὰ ταπεινὰ τῆς πόλεως ἐπιληροῦτο, τῶν μεν ὀχετῶν διὰ τὸ δοκεῖν παρεληλυθέντας τὸν χειμῶνα, κατημελημένων, τῶν δὲ ἐν τοῖς τει-

χεσιν ὁβελισκων συμφραχθέντων. What were these ὁβελίσκοι, which Rhodomannus renders *tubi murorum*, but which Wesseling fancied to be a kind of grating?—D. S. M.

ARISTOTELIAN FRAGMENTS.—The *Times* of April 27 has the following from Vienna: 'It is reported from Philippopolis that M. Petros Papageorgiu, a Greek scholar residing in that city, has discovered an ancient manuscript, containing passages of Aristotle's works. The manuscript is believed to be of the fourteenth century, and consists of 180 pages, which comprise the following extracts:—Pages 1 to 76, four books of *Περὶ Οὐρανοῦ*, 'On the Heavens'; pages 77 to 124, two books of *Περὶ Γενέσεως καὶ Φθορᾶς*, 'On Generation and Corruption'; pages 125 to 178, the first three books of *Περὶ Ψυχῆς*, 'On the Soul'; pages 179 and 180, an extract of *Περὶ σοφιστικῶν Ἐλέγχων*'.

The manuscript is in excellent preservation, the vellum being clean and strong, and all the letters being perfectly legible. It bears marginal annotations which are probably of the fifteenth century. M. Papageorgiu is now comparing the manuscript with existing editions of Aristotle's works, and he finds that the text differs in many important passages from these editions, and notably from Didot's, which is in general use on the Continent. This is the more interesting, as the manuscript gives extracts only from the genuine Aristotelian collection, and not from any works which commentators have agreed to regard as spurious. As soon as M. Papageorgiu has finished his collating he will publish a pamphlet giving the result of his researches.'

STRITAUS (Fest); TRITAUS.—How is the difference of these two forms of the same word to be explained? Initial *str-* is very common in Latin: therefore it is not likely that the absence of the *s* is due to mere phonetic loss.

May we postulate,

(1) The word would hardly ever be used except in the list of words denoting relationship (e.g. Plautus, *Persa* 57, *pater auctus proauctus abaus atauos tritaus*).

(2) The second is a larger postulate, and, if true, has much larger issues. Final *s* in Latin was regularly weak—*how* weak it is probably impossible to say, and it doubtless varied. It seems likely that it was heard least before a voiced consonant, somewhat

more before a vowel, and before a voiceless consonant as *t*. Inscriptions and the fragments of the oldest poets are not conclusive evidence on this point: they slightly confirm the suggestion, so far as they can be used.

If these two postulates be granted, we may argue:

A. If *tritaus* be the original form, then by rapid pronunciation — *proauctus abaus atauos tritaus*, the *s* from *atauos* being heard somewhat distinctly before *t* might attach itself to the word *tritaus* and give a form *stritaus*, just as 'air evt' in English made 'a newt.'

B. If on the other hand *stritaus* were original, the *s* might attach itself to *atauos*, and leave *tritaus* as 'nadder' left 'an adder.'

As to meaning, if *tritaus* be original, it is possible that the apparent meaning was once the real one, when the point from which the reckoning began was still consciously held. *Tritus* may be old Italian for *tertius*, which has not an original look: *tri* would stand between *trei* (in *tre(i)-es, tres*) and *tri* in *tritios*, on Osthoff's 'nebentonige Tiefstufe' theory. If on the other hand *stritaus* is original, the meaning is wholly dark, and probably was so to an Italian; and the new form *tritaus* would commend itself to the 'popular etymologist' of the day, by its apparent possibility of meaning.—JOHN PEILE.

THE last number of the *Greyfriar*, a Charterhouse illustrated magazine, contains a charming version of Catullus on 'Lesbian's Sparrow' by Mr. G. S. Davies. It is happily turned in the Scots' dialect, that 'kindly Dorie,' which, like its Greek prototype, lends itself so well both to humour and pathos. If we are ever to see the 'hundred best versions,' this might very well claim a place among them. The last two stanzas run thus:

'The wee thing's gane the shadowy road
That's never travelled back by ony :
Out on ye, Shades! ye're greedy aye
To grab at aught that's brave and bonny.

'Puir, foolish, fondling bonnie bird,
Ye little ken what wark ye're leavin':
Ye've gar'd my lassie's e'en grow red,
Those bonnie e'en grow red wi' grievin'.'

I should be much obliged if any reader of the *Classical Review* would tell me where I might find a complete list of the commentaries, especially the patristic and modern German, on the different books of the Bible.—M. A.

CLASSICAL EDUCATION IN FRANCE.

(*Letter from a French University Professor.*)

MONSIEUR,

La lettre par laquelle vous avez bien voulu m'inviter à entretenir les lecteurs de la *Classical Review* des études classiques en France me propose d'abord un programme bien vaste, et bien fait pour intimider un plus hardi que moi. Mais dans ce cercle si large vous en tracez aussitôt un plus étroit qu'il sera moins difficile de remplir. Vous m'indiquez un premier sujet et me posez sur ce sujet une série de questions si précises et si bien entendues, que je ne saurais faire mieux que d'essayer d'y répondre point par point. Vous désirez, dites-vous, "a clear exposition of the training undergone by your best classical scholars; what age they go to school, what are the hours of study, what are the usual books, what attention is given to composition both in Greek and Latin, what is the nature of the examinations, how far the instruction given at college is distinct from that given at school, and in fact anything that would enable an

Englishman to picture to himself the course of classical education in France, and to form some opinion of the advantages or disadvantages which your system may have over ours. I should further be very much obliged if you would let me know whether there has been much change in your system of late years." Il y a là, si je vois bien, quatre points principaux à traiter: I. l'enseignement secondaire; II. les examens; III. l'enseignement supérieur; IV. les réformes et les courants d'opinion.

I.

A ce que vousappelez *school* correspondent chez nous des établissements de différentes sortes:—

1° Les établissements d'instruction secondaire officiels, placés sous la direction du Ministre de l'Instruction publique, les lycées et les collèges. Les lycées sont fondés, ou du moins administrés et entretenus par l'Etat; les collèges—qui n'ont aucun rapport avec vos collèges anglais, veuillez bien retenir

ce point une fois pour toutes—appartiennent aux communes, et sont à leur charge, en grande partie. Les programmes, les méthodes d'enseignement, l'esprit qui régnent dans ces deux genres d'établissements sont les mêmes. Il y a d'excellents collèges ; mais en général, le lycée est considéré comme supérieur ; il a le premier choix des maîtres et dispose de ressources plus considérables.

2° Les petits séminaires et les institutions dirigées par l'Église catholique. Les petits séminaires sont fondés par l'Église catholique, placés sous la direction exclusive du clergé, et destinés à préparer aux grands séminaires, qui forment les prêtres. Mais bien des élèves de petits séminaires, soit qu'ils entrent dans les ordres, soit qu'au dernier moment ils ne se sentent pas de vocation, poursuivent les études classiques afin de se consacrer à l'enseignement. Les institutions catholiques dirigées par des ecclésiastiques étaient pour la plupart aux mains des jésuites avant l'expulsion de cet ordre, en 1880 ; elles ont passé alors en d'autres mains—pour la forme, disent certaines gens, tandis que d'autres assurent que le changement a été réel, et non à l'avantage de ces maisons.

3° Les établissements libres et non religieux. Ils sont relativement peu nombreux et de valeur très inégale. Il y a de tout, depuis les entreprises purement industrielles, les institutions qui ne visent qu'à faire arriver aux examens par la voie la plus rapide, fût-elle la plus stupide—les *fours à bachot*, en argot de collégiens—jusqu'à des écoles modèles, fondées expressément en vue d'inaugurer des méthodes d'enseignement nouvelles, ou de perfectionner les anciennes ; je nommerai par exemple l'École Monge et l'école alsacienne à Paris.

La jeunesse française est très inégalement répartie entre ces différentes sortes d'établissements. Les deux grandes masses sont les lycées et les collèges d'une part, les établissements religieux de l'autre. Les institutions libres non religieuses sont numériquement peu considérables. Les jeunes gens enfin qui reçoivent toute leur instruction dans le sein de leur familles peuvent à peine compter, tant ils sont rares.

Je pourrai revenir, à l'occasion, sur les caractères distinctifs de chaque espèce d'établissements. Pour aujourd'hui, permettez, en vue de la brièveté et de la clarté, que je prenne pour type de l'enseignement classique en France l'enseignement officiel par excellence, celui du lycée. Il est d'ailleurs permis d'affirmer, sans méconnaître les mérites d'autres institutions, que la majorité des élèves les plus distingués viennent des lycées ; et c'est des plus distingués que vous voulez m'entendre parler.

Les lycées sont de vastes établissements, réunissant jusqu'à 1000, 1500 et même 2000 élèves. Ils ont presque tous une forte proportion d'élèves internes, et offrent, à côté de l'enseignement classique, un enseignement dit spécial, destiné à préparer aux carrières commerciales, industrielles, &c. ; des classes préparatoires aux Écoles Polytechnique, de St. Cyr, &c. L'enseignement classique est reparti en trois divisions : division élémentaire, de 7 à 10 ans ; division de grammaire, de 11 à 13 ans ; division supérieure, de 14 à 17 ans. Le programme de la division élémentaire est à peu près celui des écoles primaires les plus développées, avec l'étude d'une langue vivante en plus (allemand ou anglais). On y fait des exercices de lecture, de récitation, on apprend la grammaire française, le calcul, l'histoire de France, la géographie, et un peu d'histoire naturelle.

C'est avec la division de grammaire, que commence à proprement parler les études classiques. On y consacre, en moyenne, 3 heures par semaine au français, 10 à 12 aux langues anciennes, 2 aux langues vivantes, 2 à l'histoire, 1 à la géographie, 2 au calcul

et à l'histoire naturelle. Il y a une classe cinq fois par semaine de 8 à 10 heures et de 2 à 4. Le jeudi est libre. Le dessin et les leçons facultatives, religion, musique, &c., sont en dehors des 20 heures réglementaires. On commence le latin en 6^e, le grec en 5^e. Les langues vivantes, le calcul, l'histoire naturelle, et, en 4^e, l'histoire et la géographie sont enseignés par des maîtres spéciaux, le français et les langues anciennes, de plus l'histoire et la géographie en 6^e et 5^e, sont confiés à un maître pour chaque classe.

La division supérieure est formée de trois classes de lettres, dans lesquelles se poursuit l'étude des langues anciennes, et d'une classe de philosophie, où elle est remplacée par un cours de psychologie, de logique, de morale, &c. En même temps, les mathématiques et les sciences physiques et naturelles, au lieu de 3 heures qu'elles avaient jusqu'à là, en obtiennent 8. Dans les classes de lettres, le français, le latin et le grec disposent du nombre d'heures suivant : 3, 5, 5 en 3^e ; 3, 4, 5 en 2^e ; 4, 4, 4 en rhétorique.

Mais voilà bien assez de chiffres. Il les fallait, pour former le cadre dans lequel je vais essayer enfin d'esquisser un tableau des études qui vous intéressent particulièrement. Prenons un enfant qui entrerait en 6^e au mois d'octobre, et suivons-le par la pensée jusqu'à la sortie du lycée, en 1894 ; supposons, par impossible, que ces sept ans se passent sans réforme ; nous pourrons nous faire une idée des résultats obtenus par le système d'études actuel.

Dès la fin de la première année, notre élève saura les déclinaisons et les conjugaisons latines, ainsi que les règles de syntaxe les plus indispensables. Nous n'avons guère en France qu'une grammaire, c'est celle de Lhomond. On l'a rhabillée de bien des manières, on lui a substitué des manuels faits "d'après la méthode historique" ou "comparative" ; mais on ne l'a pas remplacée. Le professeur fait acheter à ses élèves la grammaire de M. Chassang, Inspecteur général, et la leur fait apprendre par cœur, mais lui-même enseigne d'après Lhomond, qui est pour lui la grammaire, tandis que Chassang est une grammaire. Lhomond a si bien su mouler sa méthode sur nos cerveaux—à moins que, depuis cent ans, nos cerveaux ne se soient moulés sur sa méthode—que l'on ne prévoit pas comment nous nous affranchirons jamais de son autorité. Le faut-il d'ailleurs absolument ? De bons esprits ne le pensent pas ; et il est certain que si nous réussissions à introduire dans nos lycées un livre tel que par exemple l'Abrége de grammaire latine de M. Louis Havet, joignant aux éminentes qualités pédagogiques de Lhomond les qualités scientifiques qui lui manquent absolument, nous aurions un instrument d'éducation classique vraiment envisageable. On apprend donc le latin par Lhomond ; c'est à dire qu'on l'apprend en vue de l'écrire, et d'une manière pratique et rapide. La matière grammaticale, si je puis ainsi dire, est réduite au minimum, et des éléments de syntaxe sont mêlés aux éléments de morphologie à mesure qu'ils deviennent nécessaires pour pouvoir former de petites phrases latines. Aussi, au bout de peu de jours, notre jeune lycéen fera de petits thèmes, c'est à dire des traductions du français en latin. Il fera beaucoup de thèmes écrits, qui étaient les seuls autrefois, et aussi des thèmes oraux, c'est à dire des exercices de traduction de vive voix et improvisée, sous la direction du professeur. C'est l'exercice que les Allemands appellent *extemporalia*. Ces thèmes oraux, le professeur peut les inventer ; souvent il préfère les prendre tout faits dans des recueils composés *ad hoc*. On ne tarde pas à joindre au thème la version, c'est à dire la traduction écrite de textes latins. Le thème et la version alterneront jusqu'en quatrième, ce sont les devoirs par excellence.

Mais la version prendra toujours plus de place à mesure que notre élève montera de classe en classe, et finira par la prendre toute, ou presque toute. Cet exercice forme, si je ne me trompe, le trait distinctif de notre enseignement classique. Car tel qu'on le pratique, en accordant une importance pour le moins aussi grande à l'art de la traduction qu'à l'intelligence du texte, il est une véritable école de style. C'est l'école où se sont formés nos plus grands écrivains, puisque l'idée d'exercer les élèves à écrire en français sur un sujet donné est une idée toute récente. Les versions sont généralement dictées par le professeur, parce qu'il les emprunte tantôt à un auteur, tantôt à un autre. Il y a là un avantage, c'est que les élèves prennent au moins quelque idée des auteurs qu'on n'étudie pas en classe d'une manière suivie ; et un inconvénient, c'est que l'élément divinatoire, qui entre dans toute interprétation, prend ici une trop grande importance. Il va sans dire qu'il existe des recueils de morceaux choisis pour servir de versions, avec la traduction, si l'on veut. De vive voix, on explique en 6^e un petit livre dû également à Lhomond, intitulé *De Viris illustribus urbis Romae*. Il est intéressant, approprié à l'âge des élèves ; mais il a l'inconvénient de tous les livres de ce genre faits par les modernes : bien que composé de lambeaux d'auteurs anciens, le latin n'en est pas pur, ni même toujours correct. C'est d'autant plus regrettable qu'on apprend beaucoup de ce latin par cœur à un âge où les leçons se gravent dans la mémoire pour toujours. En 5^e, le *De Viris* sera remplacé par Phédre, Cornélius Nepos (douze à quinze vies) et Ovide (morceaux choisis, la valeur d'un livre, au plus). En 4^e, on passera à Quinte-Curce, César et Virgile (*Enéide* I. et II.).

A tous ces exercices, on en a joint un autre, très utilisé autrefois pour le grec, qui consiste à apprendre par cœur des mots groupés soit d'après le sens, soit d'après l'étymologie. C'est une bonne chose, assurément, mais qui serait meilleure encore si l'on avait pris soin de puiser ces mots, pour chaque classe, dans les textes qu'on y étudie. En général, dans cet enseignement élémentaire du latin, les exercices ne sont pas assez liés entre eux. Il existe, à vrai dire, certains cours de thèmes qui suivent la grammaire de paragraphe en paragraphe. On a publié aussi quelques recueils de thèmes d'imitation, dans lesquels l'élève est appelé à employer les mots et les tours qu'il vient de rencontrer dans les textes. C'est un progrès. Mais entre la grammaire et les textes, il n'y a toujours aucun rapport de progression commune, et le plus souvent chaque genre d'exercices suit sa marche à part et isolée : grammaire, thèmes, versions, explication, mots latins. Inutile d'insister sur la perte de temps et d'efforts qui en résulte.

On commence le grec dans le courant de la seconde année (classe de 5^e), et déjà à la fin de la troisième (classe de 4^e) notre élève aura parcouru toute la grammaire. A mesure qu'il apprendra la déclinaison et la conjugaison dites régulières (en 5^e), il emploiera ces premières connaissances à traduire de petites phrases composées et ordonnées à cet effet dans une chrestomathie. Tout en achevant le cours de grammaire (en 4^e), il abordera Lucien et Xénophon. C'est pendant cette année presque exclusivement que se font des exercices de traduction du français en grec. Pour le grec, on pratique peut-être plus que pour le latin le thème d'imitation. Si, en une année, il n'est pas possible de pousser bien loin, il y a pourtant des professeurs qui à force de zèle et de talent font assez avancer leurs élèves pour que dans les trois années suivantes ils puissent arriver à savoir le grec très passablement s'ils continuaient à l'étudier de la bonne manière. A bien des égards, nos professeurs

corrigeant ce que nos programmes ont de défectueux. Mais à tout il y a une limite.

C'est aussi en 4^e surtout qu'on s'applique à fixer le vocabulaire dans la mémoire des élèves. Nos pères et les plus avancés de notre génération se sont servis à cet effet du jardin des racines grecques de Lancelot. Ce livre, bien démodé, avec son choix de mots peu judicieux et ses vers mnémotechniques, est aujourd'hui remplacé par des recueils beaucoup plus conformes aux exigences de la science, comme p. ex. la *Clef du vocabulaire grec* de M. Tournier ou les *Mots grecs* de MM. Bréal et Bailly, mais moins pratiques aussi, surtout au point de vue de la mémoire. Quelle qu'en soit la cause, le fait est que, au sortir des études secondaires, on possède en général fort peu de mots grecs.

En entrant dans les classes de lettres, l'élève est censé connaître assez la grammaire latine et grecque pour n'avoir plus qu'à revoir la première pendant une année, la seconde pendant deux ans. Le thème est maintenu au programme de la 3^e et de la 2^e ; la composition latine apparaît dans le programme de rhétorique (c'est ainsi qu'on nomme la 1^e classe) ; dans la réalité, depuis que la composition latine ne figure plus à l'examen du baccalauréat, ces exercices ont beaucoup de peine à vivre, surtout en seconde et en rhétorique. Il faut que le professeur possède une grande autorité et fasse de grands efforts pour obtenir que même seulement l'élite des élèves s'y applique sérieusement. Ce ne sont plus guère que les futurs candidats à l'École normale qui apprennent à écrire en latin dans quelques lycées de Paris où l'on redouble sa rhétorique à cet effet. Ce qu'on a ôté à la composition latine, on a cru l'ajouter à l'étude des auteurs ; les programmes, de ce côté, sont d'une richesse exubérante. A Virgile, commence en 4^e et qui s'achève en rhétorique, s'ajoutent, de classe en classe, Tite-Live (3^e décadé), Saluste, les lettres de Pline, plusieurs discours et petits traités philosophiques de Cicéron, puis Horace tout entier, Tacite (*Agricola*, et 8 livres des *Annales* et des *Histoires*), enfin une pièce de Térence et des extraits de Lucrèce. Il semble que notre élève sortira du lycée familiarisé avec tous les chefs d'œuvre de la littérature latine. Malheureusement, dans le temps consacré au latin, il n'est pas possible de parcourir tout ce programme. Pour en voir au moins le plus possible, on recommande beaucoup la lecture dite cursive des auteurs. Bon nombre de professeurs, et des meilleurs, la considèrent comme peu utile ; et il est certain qu'elle ne peut l'être qu'à trois conditions ; il faut que les élèves aient déjà acquis une certaine sûreté dans le maniement de la langue, qui ne s'obtient guère qu'en écrivant en latin ; il faut que cette lecture cursive soit précédée de l'étude approfondie d'une bonne partie de l'ouvrage qu'on parcourt ensuite d'un pas plus rapide ; il faut enfin qu'on ait le temps d'en faire beaucoup, de lire plusieurs chants de Virgile, plusieurs livres de Tite-Live, &c. Le fait est qu'aujourd'hui, si les élèves voient un peu plus d'auteurs qu'autrefois, ils n'en sont pas plus habiles à les lire à livre ouvert, ils le sont moins, parce que, sur ce point comme sur d'autres, dans les récentes réformes, on a voulu le but sans vouloir les moyens. Nous sommes en train d'apprendre par expérience ce que nous n'avons pas voulu croire quand les voix les plus autorisées du Conseil supérieur nous l'ont dit, c'est que l'on n'arrive pas à lire le latin sans l'écrire. La version est plus indépendante de la connaissance grammaticale de la langue que l'explication orale ; et cependant même la version latine baisse ; les Facultés l'ont constaté à plusieurs reprises aux examens du baccalauréat. Chez vous, la composition latine est encore en honneur. Ne vous la laissez pas enlever si vous

tenez à sauver l'étude sérieuse et vraiment profitable des auteurs.

L'écart entre la hauteur du programme et le niveau qu'atteignent les élèves est plus forte encore en grec, parce que le thème grec ne franchit même pas le seuil de la 3^{me}. Xénophon, Hérodote, Plutarque, Platon, Démosthène, Homère, Euripide, Sophocle et Aristophane sont déchiffrés, le plus souvent à l'aide de traductions, par des élèves qui sont à peine de force à comprendre vraiment un dialogue de Lucien.

Si l'on ne peut pas dire que l'étude personnelle des auteurs anciens traverse en ce moment une période de prospérité (car tout n'est pas perdu, heureusement ; on reviendra à des vues plus saines, il faut l'espérer), en revanche notre jeune ami ne quittera pas les bancs du lycée sans connaître au moins l'époque où ces auteurs ont vécu, le titre et le sujet de leurs principaux écrits, sans avoir, en un mot, une idée générale des littératures classiques. "Le professeur," dit le programme, "sans faire un cours suivi d'histoire littéraire, s'attachera à propos de l'explication des auteurs et de la correction des devoirs, à mettre en lumière les caractères essentiels de la littérature des principales époques, à marquer la filiation des grandes œuvres et à indiquer la place occupée par les genres secondaires." Ce programme est en général fort bien rempli. Il répond au goût prononcé des professeurs et des élèves pour tout ce que l'on a coutume de comprendre aujourd'hui sous le nom de critique littéraire, et qui peut former un élément précieux d'une bonne éducation classique.

On a fait aussi des livres d'après ce programme ; mais comme ils servent plus encore aux jeunes étudiants qu'aux lycéens, il sera plus convenable d'y revenir à propos de l'enseignement supérieur. Disons plutôt un mot ici des éditions classiques d'auteurs anciens. En général, elles sont de qualité très inférieure. Fabriquées sur commande et à la hâte par des hommes nullement préparés à cette tâche difficile, elles présentent le plus souvent des textes pris au hasard, des notes cueillies ci et là, au hasard aussi, ou tracées au courant de la plume, d'après l'inspiration du moment. Les meilleures de ces produits sont encore les plus malhonnêtes : ce sont les contrefaçons plus ou moins déguisées de quelque édition allemande, Teubner ou Weidmann. J'ai hâte d'ajouter que si une fâcheuse concurrence entre libraires inonde le marché de ces articles de

pacotille, nous commençons à avoir un petit stock d'éditions classiques d'une tout autre qualité, faites par des savants compétents, familiarisés préalablement avec leur auteur, et sachant ce qu'il faut de temps, de peine, de soin, de méditation, de science et de conscience pour faire une édition classique passable. C'est ainsi que nous possédons, pour le grec, un Manuel d'Épictète, par Thurot, qui est, dans sa simplicité élémentaire, un petit chef-d'œuvre ; plusieurs discours de Démosthène et plusieurs pièces d'Euripide par M. Henri Weil ; un Sophocle de M. Tournier ; deux vies de Plutarque, par Ch. Graux : en latin, plusieurs livres de Tite-Live par MM. Benoist et Riemann ; les mêmes par M. Harant ; des discours de Ciceron par M. Émile Thomas ; un autre par M. Gantrelle ; les Histoires de Tacite par le même, &c., &c. Nommons encore, comme ayant donné l'exemple, le Virgile de M. Benoist. Vous trouverez sans doute les notes de la plupart de ces éditions un peu laténiques, comme vous l'avez dit à propos du *De Signis* de M. Thomas (ci-dessus No. 3, p. 72). Pour nos élèves, nous serons bien contents s'ils font leur profit de ce qui leur est offert sous cette forme concise, s'ils ne trouvent dans des livres destinés à leur servir de guides, ni grossières erreurs, ni vagues banalités, et nous nous félicitons en tous cas de voir entre leurs mains des textes convenablement constitués.

Je n'ai rien dit encore de la versification latine, et je n'ai pas grand chose à en dire. On ne fait plus de vers latins au lycée. Cet exercice avait fini par prendre trop d'importance, mais il avait une grande utilité ; il faisait apprendre la prosodie, et il rendait l'élève sensible au charme du vers de Virgile. On l'a remplacé par des notions sur le vers iamboïque, données à propos de Phédre, en 5^e, sur l'hexamètre, à propos d'Ovide et de Virgile, en 4^e, enfin sur les principaux mètres lyriques d'Horace, en 3^e. Malheureusement, au sortir du lycée il ne reste guère de traces de ces notions qui, à cause de la différence trop grande entre la versification française et celle des Latins, ne peuvent faire comprendre l'effet musical du mètre. Les odes d'Horace et les éloges de Virgile ne sont pour nos élèves qu'une sorte de prose poétique. Aussi sommes-nous saisis d'un étonnement mêlé de respect quand nous voyons paraître dans vos colonnes des pièces de vers non seulement latins, mais grecs !

(*To be continued.*)

UNIVERSITY INTELLIGENCE.

OXFORD.

CONGREGATION has decided that Bodleian books are not to be lent, unless by decree of Convocation. But the discussion on a subsequent amendment seemed to show that there would be no insuperable objection to the temporary loan of books to University officials at the Museum and other University institutions, which would suffer considerably from an absolute denial of the right to borrow.

The Modern Language School is not yet started, but the statute will probably pass. It would be as well, however, if the word 'Literature' could be struck out wherever it occurs : the subject is inadequately represented on the board of studies, and the philological side of the examination is so over-weighted as to leave little chance for the other departments. It may have been well to include the languages of the north and east of Europe in the scheme : but English is unduly hampered with Gothic, even if Anglo Saxon be absolutely neces-

sary :—our literature owes nothing to Gothic, whatever the language may owe : and it is difficult to see why Greek should not be as indispensable from a literary point of view, as Gothic from the linguistic stand-point.

Mr. H. F. Pelham has been appointed Reader in Ancient History, and will probably keep up the tradition of what has hitherto been the most successful of all our readerships. Convocation has, for the first time in our recollection, thrown out a proposed grant of money to the Museum. The work, it was shown, is already being done by two colleges, and the University has no money to spend, even for necessary purposes. Nobody wishes to starve the Museum : but the possibility of an adverse vote will tend to make a smaller grant go further, and to check the idea that double provision for single needs is indispensable.

refo
answ
diffi
acc
cita
by t
the
the

T
not
out
no
dive

B
Gree
sent
hold
and
grav
Mus
for
whic
with
Rom
near
to ac
and
foun
Cypri
Drou
Bram
the B
(ix. p
Assu
Revie
Mus
woul
rende

M
are o
may
if lai
by A
doct
moun
fiftee
Abov

in tw
the s
to th
the t
Apoll
the c
Gree
funer
Egypt
the s
wards
Gréba

And
of an
with

CAMBRIDGE.

The Committee formed for the introduction of the reformed pronunciation of Latin have considered the answers to their circular, which show that no material difficulty has been felt in the experiment. They accordingly recommend that the scheme of pronunciation set forth in their syllabus be generally adopted by the teachers of Classics in Cambridge, at least in the teaching of candidates for honours beginning with the ensuing Michaelmas term.

The class list of the Classical Tripos, Part I., has not unnaturally excited much interest. It has fallen out that amongst the undergraduates of a weak year no one was found to deserve a place in the first division of the first class. But in the list of the

women who have passed the same examination Miss A. F. Ramsay, Girton, appears alone in the first division of the first class. She may therefore be regarded as Senior Classic, in spite of the change of system introduced six years ago with a view to substitute for the old order of merit, divisions or 'brackets' in alphabetical order. It should be remembered, however, that the Craven scholar for the year was not in the competition, he having already passed in the second division of the first class in 1886, at the end of his sixth term.

Mr. G. Tilley, of King's, has been appointed University Lecturer in Roman History.

(For Examinations see page 215.)

ARCHÆOLOGY.

BRITISH MUSEUM.—The Museum has acquired a Greek gem of onyx in the form of a scarabaeus, representing a warrior (possibly Achilles) seated, and holding two spears in his left hand with his helmet and shield beside him. It is a delicate piece of engraving of the early part of the fifth century. The Museum has also acquired a circular leaden tablet for attachment by four nails to some object from which it has been wrenched. It is inscribed in Greek with the names of three freedmen, and dates from Roman times. It was found at the ancient Nervia near Bordighera. The Museum has, however, failed to acquire the cylix with the signature of Cachrylion and the two others with the signature of Hermaios, found a little while ago at Poli-tis-Chrysokou in Cyprus and lately sold by auction at the Hôtel Drouot. These were all three bought for Mr. van Brantighem. Professor Sayce has now published in the Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology (ix. pp. 202 ff.) a copy which he made a year ago at Assuan of the Ptolemaic inscription noticed in this Review (p. 119) among other acquisitions to the Museum. A comparison of his copy with the original would have saved him several conspicuous errors in his rendering.—C. T.

MISCELLANEA FROM EGYPT.—The following notes are of no special importance in themselves, but they may perhaps fit in and illustrate some other remains, if laid before students. A tablet was found this year by Arabs at Naukratis, bearing on it a two-valve door slightly recessed in doorway, which is surmounted by an Egyptian cornice, the whole about fifteen inches high: the door was painted red. Above it, on the lintel, is cut

ΑΠΟΛΛΩΤΟΣ | ΕΙΜΙΤΟΩΛΑΙΝΟ

in two lines; while on the cornice is faintly scratched the same inscription, apparently a first memorandum to the stone-cutter. The upper inscription, however, though not legible throughout, shows by its spacing the reading Apollodotos in place of the strange Apollotos, which seems to be due to a confusion of the cutter. The interest of it is in showing how a Greek adopted the Egyptian type of a doorway for a funeral stela, while making it in Greek, and not Egyptian, fashion. It appears to be of the middle of the sixth century B.C. I purchased it, and afterwards exchanged it at the Bulak Museum, as M. Grébaut was interested in it.

Another curious block, which I saw in the hands of an Arab dealer, is about fourteen inches square, with two serpents in very high relief on it. They

are reared up, facing, one with the usual crown of Osiris, the other with that of Isis; they differ, the one being plain round-bodied, and the other thicker and with the cobra hood spread out. Pairs of uraei often differ somewhat thus, showing a difference of sexes, even when not bearing Serapis and Isis heads as they do on bracelets in general. The Greek interest comes in with a central device between them; this is in sunk relief, not raised like the serpents on the face of the stone, and shows the seated griffin with one paw placed upon—not a wheel, like the type of Alexandria—but an eight-leaved rosette. This is a trifling difference such as an Egyptian sculptor would be liable to make. It seems probable that this block was built into a wall, perhaps over the door of a house, with the serpents as guardian genii of the house, and the griffin added as a sort of personal device of the owner.

Of Graffiti I have noted the following, which may be unpublished:—

Over a tomb at Tehneh :

**ΗΛΕΝΑΛΛΕΙ
ΝΔΡΟCΘΜΟΥΤΟC**

At Esneh, on a pillar :

**ΚΙΛ
ΛΟΥΠΟC**

At El Kab, on the first temple in the valley :

**ΠΛΑΤΩΝ
ΕΡΜΩΝΟC
ΗΚΩΠΑΡΑ
ΤΗΜΕΓΙΣΤΗΝ
ΘΕΑΝCΜΙΟΙΝ**

Also

**ΝΙΚΗΡΑΤΟC
ΟΨΙΚΤΟP
ΑΠΙC**

Near Silsileh :

**ΦΙΛΗΜΩΝ, ΠΕΤΡΟC, ΠΑΥCΙ,
ΜΑХΟC
ΔΩΡΙΩΝ, ΜΑΛΧΙΩΝ, ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΑM**

In a tomb at Sisileh :

ΣΤΑΥΡΟΣΔΩΝ
ΧΡΙΣΤΙΑΝΩΝ

In another :

ΠΙΣΤΟΚΛΗΣ ΕΥΜΕΝΟΥΣ ΗΚ//ΕΝ
ΤΩΙΚΒΛΠΑΧΩΝΙΟ

At Assuan, on a block of granite by the Philae road, magnificently cut in letters four inches high, sharp, deep, and perfectly straight and regular, is

ΠΥΘΟΓΕΙΤΩΝ
ΝΕΙΔΩΝΟΣ
ΣΑΜΙΟΣ

I visited what appear to be the ruins of Kanobos, about a mile S. W. of Abukir; it is a large site, with Egyptian statues and Roman mosaic pavements. The attribution of it seems highly probable, as I am told by Mr. Grant (who is reclaiming Lake Abukir) that no other site approaching to such a size is to be seen for a very long way east of this. Unhappily a fort has been made in what appears to have been the temenos of the great temple.—W. M. FLINDERS PETRIE.

[Travellers interested in Graffiti may be warned that the Greek metrical inscription of fourteen lines very prominently cut on the side of a gateway at the Ramesseum at Thebes dates from the present century and celebrates two travellers named Wild and Prichard.—The third of the Graffiti given above is published in Böök C. I. G. 4835; but less accurately.—The second line of the eighth reads, In the 22nd year on the 19th of the (Egyptian) month Pachon.—C. T.]

THASIOLE TOMBS.—The island of Thasos, owing to its wealth in minerals and marbles, retained its importance longer than most of the islands and towns of the East, down in fact to the fall of the Byzantine Empire. During the days of imperial Rome, Thasos actually maintained its independence, electing its own senate, and issuing its own laws, and was not included in the province of Thrace until the fashion for Thasiote marble in Rome had passed away. The marble quarries of Thasos to the south of the island are very extensive, and bear signs of having been more worked than even those of Paros. A whole promontory down by the sea has been cut away foot by foot leaving a large flat surface on the sea level over which the waves dash in winter, and where in summer the inhabitants collect salt, calling it from this fact Alki. We have many instances of the popularity of Thasiote marble in Rome. Seneca tells us "fish preserves were made of Thasiote marble." The Euripides in the Vatican is of the same: and Belloni asserts that the exterior of the pyramid of Caius Cestius was coated with Thasiote marble.

One of the natural results of possessing an unlimited supply of marble was that the Thasiotes lavished it to an immense extent on the mausolea and sarcophagi

for the reception of their dead: the vast cemetery of the ancient capital of the island must have been perfectly magnificent to behold in the days of its splendour, as an account of slight investigations we made amongst the ruins will testify. On quitting the western wall of the old city, which is still easily traceable, you enter a large plain, bounded on three sides by mountains, on the other by the sea. It roughly forms a parallelogram, two miles in length along the coast, and a mile and a half from the coast to the mountains. The whole of this plain is now covered with olives and brambles, but in ancient times it was covered with massive marble tombs, all erected in straight lines radiating from one point, namely, a gate in the city wall, which is still adorned on the northern side with a fine stele standing against the wall 15 feet in height, and decorated in the centre with a handsome bas-relief representing a man seated on a chair and a woman playing some instrument which is unfortunately damaged but looks as if it had been a harp. This was in all probability the gate of the tombs through which the dead were carried.

Of these straight lines of tombs I was able to distinguish ten quite distinctly. The finest tombs appear to have been erected on the two outer lines, namely the one immediately at the edge of the sea, and the one running along the first spurs of the mountain. Numbers of fine sepulchral monuments, large sarcophagi with long metrical and other inscriptions, have from time to time been brought to light amongst the olive trees, notably, the so-called tomb of Antiphon, built on a small projecting rock, on which a figure was found wearing a tunic of gold, which was unfortunately stolen by a Bulgarian workman in excavating the tomb; and the colossal eagle, which is now in the museum at Bulak, was found amongst a nest of these tombs at the edge of a stream which runs through this plain.

At the end of the line nearest the sea, just at the edge of the mountains and nearly two miles from the town, we were attracted by the debris of what proved on excavation to have been a handsome mausoleum surrounded by a group of sarcophagi; but owing to its having been converted into a church in later times and thickly overgrown with brambles it required much work before we could restore the original plan. On commencing our work at the eastern side, where the ground began to rise towards the mound, we soon came across two huge marble sarcophagi, the lids of which had been broken in centuries ago to extract the precious metal which the Thasiotes invariably in some form or another put into their tombs. Vases are exceedingly rare in Thasos, gold objects being more frequently found; and this is accounted for by their possession on the opposite mainland of the gold mines in mount Pangaeus. One of the sarcophagi had no inscription; but the other, which was 7 feet long by 3 feet 4 inches deep, and which was covered by a lid adorned at each corner with a boss, 1 foot 5 inches high, and a roof sloping up to the same elevation as the bosses, carried the following inscription:—

ΦΙΛΟΥΜΑΙΝΗ ΚΩΜΕΙΔΟΣ ΠΡΟΣΦΙΛΗΣ ΧΑΙΡΕ
ΤΡΥΓΗΤΙΟΝ ΚΩΜΙΔΟΣ ΠΡΟΣΦΙΛΗΣ ΧΑΙΡΕ

These inscriptions are interesting from the fact that φιλούμαντη is spelt, instead of φιλούμενη, which goes far to prove that *ai* in those days as now was pronounced as *e*, and the use of the diphthong suggests that then, as now, the long syllable followed the accent, and again we have *ei* similarly confounded, which would make it appear that they were pronounced

then as now similarly. On many Thasiote tombs χάιρε is spelt χέπε, proving uncontestedly that in those days the pronunciation was the same as it is in modern Greek.

On pursuing our work we found the fragments of another pretty little sarcophagus, adorned at one corner with a female figure with wings, holding in

her hand a crown ; above it and at each of the four corners were rams' heads, and a garland ran all round, supported in the front by the figure of a naked

child. Close to this we found fragments of another small sarcophagus, also adorned with rams' heads and a garland, and carrying the inscription :—

ΕΡΜΗΣ ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΥ ΠΡΟΣΦΙΛΗΣ ΧΑΙΡΕ.

The large mausoleum itself, around which these tombs were grouped, stood on a platform approached by five grades of marble steps, the platform being 27 feet long by 11½ feet wide at the edge of the highest grade.

In the lowest grade of steps we found an incision had been made and a large sarcophagus inserted underneath the building ; this was approached by a narrow passage between two walls, 18 feet long ; without destroying the whole superstructure we could not uncover this sarcophagus so as to see if it had an inscription on it, and as we saw that it had been opened at the side to extract whatever of value it had contained, we deemed it best to leave it as it was. Evidently this was the tomb of the individual to whose honour the mausoleum had been erected, for it was the only sarcophagus we could find actually under the building.

On the top of the platform there had once stood a very handsome and massive building, the lower chamber of which was formed of huge blocks of marble, with a corniced edge on the side facing the sea, namely that 27 feet long. Apparently there had only been two blocks of marble on this side, one of which bore the inscription—

ΦΙΛΟΦ
ΦΙΛΟ

in letters of a good period, suggesting that the name of the man to whose honour the mausoleum had been erected was one Philophron, son of Philophron. On the other large block we found a long metrical inscription evidently added at a later date.

Concerning the building which surmounted this lower chamber we can of course only offer speculations from the nature of the fragments of marble columns and decorations found amongst the ruins. Apparently huge stones with corniced edges formed the roof of this lower chamber, on the top of which stood an open Doric building supported by columns, of which we found many drums ; these columns had been very fine, 2 feet 7 inches in diameter at the base, and with 22 flutings ; the drums had been fastened together by neatly made iron rivets soldered into the marble with lead.

We also found the body of a well-formed marble lion, with traces of a mane down the back, and with a girth of 4 feet 1 inch. This fragment of the lion was found on the side towards the sea, and doubtless there had been another or others at the corners of the building.

A close examination of this one mausoleum enabled us to form some faint idea of the magnificent effect which this plain of tombs by the sea-shore must have afforded in the days of Thasiote splendour. Amongst the thickly-growing brambles are many indications of mausolea of equal magnificence, the excavation of which we did not undertake. The whole plain in which is the olive plantation is covered with 12 feet of soil above the original level on which the tombs stood, making it of course a matter of impossibility to recover the form and dimensions of many of them.

Tombs of the poorer class seem altogether to have been excluded from this plain, and we found many of these in lines running up a narrow valley at the back of the town. Most of them consisted of small terra-

cotta sarcophagi about 3 feet square, some decorated with a pretty pattern, others perfectly plain, and each having in it nothing but a small vase of rude workmanship. The presence of golden ornaments in a few of the tombs which have lately been found is sufficient to account for the general rifling of them before the fall of earth had covered them, and before certain erections of later Roman and Byzantine date had been constructed above them.

The marble quarries of Thasos, as I have said, were situated to the south of the island, and on a narrow tongue of land joining the marble promontory to the island was situated a town which seems to have been the second in importance in the island, and probably wholly devoted to the commerce in marble. Here we found buried in the sand by the shore other tombs, and fragments of beautifully-worked sarcophagi ; one lid had bosses 1 foot 10 inches wide by 1 foot 3 inches high, decorated with female heads ; another had the bosses decorated with wreaths of flowers, and the sloping roofs of the lids were occasionally decorated with well-worked diaper patterns. In the centre of the village stands a very large sarcophagus with a metrical inscription, which M. Perrot published in his monograph on Thasos, and on a tomb we dug up in the sand we found an inscription to the memory of a lady, which tomb was 6 feet 1 inch long by 2 feet 8 inches wide, and edged with a neat border.

On the top of the hill overlooking the sea we found amongst broken sarcophagi the fragments of several inscriptions—some plain, some metrical. A thorough excavation of this spot would undoubtedly bring to light interesting and varied devices in marble sarcophagi ; the ground is full of them, but owing to the accumulation of soil they are at a great depth.—

J. THEODORE BENT.

[Thasos is held by the family of the Khedive : hence the transfer of the Thasiote eagle to Bulak.—C. T.]

Revue Archéologique. March—April, 1887. Paris.

1. M. Bazin on remains of the Roman theatre at Antibes, mostly demolished in 1691 to supply materials for Vauban's fortifications : plan. 5. M. Muntz on the remains of ancient Rome at the Renaissance : concluded. 6. M. Deloche on signet rings of the Merovingian period : continued. 7. M. Monceaux argues that the poet Avienus was really proconsul of Africa, although the old date for his proconsulate must be abandoned. 8 Dr. Nérotos-Bey on Greek inscriptions from Alexandria, some of them previously published : to be continued. 9. M. Guillemand on Gaulish inscriptions, starting with the bilingual of Tol : to be continued. M. Théodore Reinach receives Mr. Head's *Historia Numorum* with faint praise.—C. T.

Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique. April, 1887. Athens and Paris.

1. MM. Cousin and Deschamps on a decree of the Roman Senate dated 15 August 39 B.C. found by them within the temple of Zeus Panamaros near Stratoniceia in Caria. 3. M. Fongères summarises the results of his excavations at Delos last summer, and publishes thirty-eight of the inscriptions that he found there : in these are signatures of the sculptors Agasias of Ephesus, son of Menophilos ; perhaps Antisthenes ; Boethos and Theodosios ; Eutychides (of

Miletos); and Hephaistion of Athens, son of Myron. 4. M. Holleaux publishes a marble head found by him near the temple of Apollo Ptoos and belonging to the statue of an 'Apollo' with the dedication by Pythias and Aschirion previously found there and

published by him in the *Bulletin* last year: two plates. 5. M. Foucart suggests that the record of victories discovered at Olympia and hitherto assigned to Theagenes of Thasos should rather be assigned to Diagoras of Rhodes.—C. T.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

Athenaeum: 21 May; an obituary notice of Mr. Keith-Falconer. 4 June; a review of F. H. Chase's Chrysostom, a study in the history of Biblical interpretation. 4 June; review of Lupton's life of Colet.

Academy: 21 May; a letter from the Bishop of Durham to show that the list of Bishops of Rome contained in Hegesippus' lost memoirs (Euseb. *H. E.* 4.22) is preserved in Epiphanius' *Haer.* 27, 6; a letter from Rob. Ellis from Rome communicating his discovery of a new codex of the *Culex* of which the next number of the *Journal of Philology* is to give an account. Its date is the end of the 14th century; 'a passage in that poem till now given up as incurably vitiated is convincingly restored by the new codex': a letter from R. Brown, jun., on the Etruscan Numerals. 28 May; a review of Wellidon's Rhetoric by J. E. Sandys. 4 June; a letter from T. W. Allen on compendiums in Greek Palaearctia (ἀπαντά &c.); S. G. Owen emends Ovid *Tristia* 5. 5. 45 nata pudicitia est moris probitas fidesque, read oris for moris, ep. Martial 11.103 tanta tibi est animi probitas orisque. 11 June; letters from F. J. A. Hort and J. O. Westwood on the Cod. Amiatinus, letter from M. A. Stein on the derivation of meridies, letter from W. M. Lindsay on compendiums in Greek palaeography; reviews of A. Darmesteter's *La Vie des Mots*, by H. Bradley, and of Head's *Historia Numorum* by C. Oman; an account of the performance of the *Autularia* at Melbourne University with a new conclusion by Prof. Tucker. 18 June; reviews of J. Réville, *La religion à Rome sous les Sévères* by F. T. Richards, of R. Ellis' Fables of Avianus by A. S. Wilkins; Isaac Taylor, in answer to A. Lang, attempts to explain the story of Cupid and Psyche as a natural-myth; an account of a paper by J. H. Moulton at Camb. Phil. Society.

The *Journal of Education* contains an interesting paper by A. Sidgwick on the 'Future of Classical Education.' He describes the expansion of classical studies, which has taken place of late years, as being 'in fact a renaissance'; gives a warning against over-specialisation on the part of teachers, and the substitution of erudition for training on the part of learners; speaks of the danger of the *production* of knowledge outrunning the *distribution* of it, and of the need of an intermediate class between the researchers and the general body of teachers. He thinks that in future the early training will be more systematic than in the past, but that in the higher stages there will be more general enlightenment, less mere grammar, perhaps no verse composition; 'it will be common perhaps for a boy to drop prose composition'; but the school will be a place of more varied life and interest, the masters will take up different lines of special study. While the Latin and Greek languages will be as well known as now to the few, the many will have a far greater knowledge of the matter than at present, and along with this a good working knowledge of the language, such as will enable them to have a familiar acquaintance with the history, the people, and the life of the ancients.

Expositor, June. Mr. Gore, criticising Prof. Sandys' papers from the Anglican point of view,

expresses general agreement in regard to the origin of the Christian ministry, but desiderates 'a fuller recognition of the principle of succession.' Mr. W. H. Simcox rejects Völter's analysis of the Apocalypse into an original work of the Apostle John, written about 65, an appendix by the same about 69, and three later recensions. Similarly Vischer's hypothesis favoured by Prof. Harnack, that the book is a Jewish apocalypse with Christian interpolations, is rejected on the ground that the Christian idea of the Messiah pervades the whole, and that, if the groundwork is pre-Christian, it is incredible that the name of St. John should have been substituted for that of the original writer. Mr. Simcox is himself inclined to believe that we have, besides the original apocalypse of St. John, four distinct visions contained in vii. 9-17, xi. 1-13, xiv. 14-20, xvii., 'visions, however, of the same seer or of the same prophetic school.' Prof. Westcott continues his series on the Revised Version, this time pointing out its value in restoring uniformities of language. The number closes with a slight paper by Dr. Schaff on the German and Anglo-American revisions of the Bible.

Hermer, vol. xxii. part 2, contains: 1. Über die dem Joannes Antiochenus zugeschriebenen Excerpta Salmasiana, by W. Ph. Boissévain, who argues that the Excerpta of the Codex Regius 1763, placed by C. Müller among the other fragments of Johan. Antioch. are not genuine with the exception perhaps of fragments 1-29. The arguments are partly negative—such as (1) the contradiction between some of the Salm. Exce. and the genuine fr.; (2) the agreement of the Salm. Exce. with Dion rather than Herodian in the period from Commodus to Gordian; (3) the absence of all trace in the Salm. Exce. of the Greek translation of Eutropius used by Johan. Antioch.—partly positive (1) the presence in some of the Salm. Exce., referring to the kingly period, of Byzantine pedantry alien to the genuine fragments, and (2) in the imperial history the coincidence of the Salm. Exce. with the anecdotes of Cedrenus, Glycas, Constantinus Manasses, &c., which points to one common source. 2. Die Textesüberlieferung der angeblich Hippokratischen Schrift über die alte Heilkunde, by H. Kühlewein, who maintains that the Codex Parisinus A is the best authority for the text of ἡρῷον ἱατρικῆς. Where this needs correcting, it must be by means of the Marcianus 269, which in most cases supports the good readings of the former, and in some places corrects it. To support this view of the value and functions of the two Codices, many examples are given. 3. Die erste Rede des Antiphon, by U. v. Wilamowitz-Möllendorf. An interesting analysis 'der ältesten attischen Gerichtsrede,' in which the essential legal points are clearly brought out and explained. 4. Demotika der Metocheion II. by the same: continued from previous number. From the fact that the demes of the μέτοικοι are given, the writer seeks to prove that they must have stood in some legal relation to the demes, and so to the tribes; that in fact they were not in the position of mere clients needing a προστάτης, according to the common view, but quasi-citizens. To prove this position he claims to show that the μέτοικοι

share both the rights and duties and religious ceremonies of the *δημόσιαι*. Thus they served as *δηλίται*; contributed to the *εισφορά*, were subject to the *χορηγία*; took part in the *Παναθηναϊα*, &c. *A priori* too, the Athenians must have found it almost necessary to incorporate the thousands of *μέτοικοι* with the citizen body. The adverse testimony of the grammarians, of Isokrates, and of Hypereides is then explained away. The truth may be that the *προστάτης* was a member of the deme, who introduced the *μέτοικοι* into it, and was his *ἐγγυητής*: and so the *προστασία* ended with the simple act, but was falsely thought to be permanent. But if the *μέτοικος* only became one by entry into a deme, he could not hold the same position as a *ξένος*, in spite of the definition of Aristoph. of Byzant. The position of the *ξένος* rested on *ομιλούσαι*, which were liable to be cancelled by war: that of the *μέτοικος* on Athenian law, and was unalterable. The article is able and interesting, but will hardly be judged to have settled the question.

5. *Ueber das Capitel de versuum generibus bei Diomedes*, by G. Schultz. An attempt to discover the sources of this chapter of Diomedes and to explain the arbitrary arrangement of the metres in it. Schultz believes that a number of various treatises were made use of, and unscientifically mixed up. The article is ingenious, and for specialists instructive.

6. *Florentinische Homerscholien*, by H. Schrader. A discussion on the value of the Scholia to Homer in the Codex Laurentianus, plur. xxxii 3. In opposition to E. Maas in vol. xix. pp. 287 ff. Schrader thinks that the Laurent and Venetus B are nearly of the same date, and copied from a common source. The only special value therefore of the former is to provide Scholia of the 'prima manus' for ff. 68, 69, and 145 of Venetus B, which are supplied by a later hand. A similar opinion is given of the value of the Scholia to the Odyssey in Codex Laurentianus, plur. lvi. 32.

7. *Stadtrechtbriefe von Orkistos und Tymandos*, by Th. Mommsen. An interesting account of Prof. Ramsay's finding and decipherment of the inscription given imperfectly in C.I.L. iii. p. 63. The emperor's letter to Ablabius is here given in full, and part of the petition of the Orkisten. Part of a similar document is added, communicated by W. J. R. S. Sterrett, referring to Tymandos in Pisidia.

8. *Zu Athenaeus*, by G. Kaibel. Are the excerpts from the two first books of Athenaeus in the Lexicon of Suidas taken from the epitome of the books or from the larger edition now lost? Suidas certainly used the larger edition for the books now extant in the Venetian Codex. There is therefore a presumption that he used it for the first two. This presumption is confirmed by a number of instances in which Suidas contains points which are omitted in the epitome, and which he must therefore have got from the original.—Miscellen: Scenisches by C. Robert, who suggests that the two actors in the votive relief found in the Peiraeus are holding mirrors, not tympana, and that the figure sitting at the foot of the *κλινη* of Dionysus is neither his wife, nor Artemis Munchia, but the nymph of the victorious *φυλή*, who in the *μεγάλα Διονύσια* is wedded to the god of the festival. This is represented on the great crater in the museum at Naples.

Rheinisches Museum, vol. xlii. pt. 2 contains: Die pseudo-heraklitischen Briefe, u. ihr Verfasser (E. Pfeiderer.) 'Letters 4 to 7 certainly, 8 and 9 almost certainly, and all most probably, were the work of an educated Jew of Alexandria, perhaps the writer of the Book of Wisdom.' Zur Entwicklung der kaiserlichen Stadtpräfektur (E. Klebs.) 'That Augustus originated the appointment of *praefectus*

urbi, to act as police magistrate and civil head of the *cohortes urbanae*; hence the correction of xx. into xv. in Tac. *Ann.* is unnecessary.' Zu den historischen Arbeiten der ältesten Peripatetiker (F. Dümmler.) i. Politeien, Politik u. *πολιτικὰ τὰ πρὸς τοὺς κατοίκους*. ii. *Νόμοι καὶ νομιμὰ βαρβαρικά*. iii. Sakralalterthüner. Investigating how far Plutarch, Nicolaus, &c. are indebted to Theophrastus on the above subjects. Philodemus über das homerische Fürstenideal (F. Bücheler.) On the Homeric quotations in the fragmentary work of Philodemus, *περὶ τοῦ καθ' Οὐρηροῦ ἀγαθῶν Βασιλέων*. Die Gründung von Naukratis (G. Hirschfeld.) 'Naukratis was given to the Greeks by Amasis, and the earliest date for its antiquities is 570 B.C. The Abu Simbel inscriptions date from Psammetichus I.' Zur Entzifferung der messapischen Inschriften, iv. (W. Deecke.) Treating of the six most important of those published in Notizie degli Scavi di Antichità, 1884. Nachahmer u. Vorbilder des Dichters Gregorios von Nazianz (A. Ludwich.) 'His poems influenced Nonnus and show acquaintance with Aratus, Theocritus, &c.' Polykrates Anklage, u. *Lysias*' Vertheidigung des Sokrates (R. Hirzel.) 'That the oration against Socrates current in antiquity bore the name of Polykrates, and called forth in reply Lysias' *Defense*, Xenophons *Memorabilia*, and the episode in Plato's *Meno*.' Ueber die Nausikaepisode (F. Marx.) 'Read *τεθῆτα φαενήν* in vi. 209. Expunge ll. 129, 136, 221, 222, read *μετάλθεν* in 135, and then the *πτύρθος* is simply a *ἰκετήριος κλάδος*.' Alexandrinische Studien (A. Gercke.) (1) The date of Magas of Cyrene. 'Reigned from 300—297 to 251—247 B.C.' (2) The accession to power of Hiero II. 'Hiero was named general in 270 and *βασιλεὺς* in 265: the Mamertine expedition therefore bears the latter date.' (3) Places Ptolemy II.'s marriage with his sister Arsinoe between 276 and 270. Quelle der Ueberlieferung ueber Ammonius Sakkas (H. von Arnim.) 'The third chapter of Nememius, *de Anima* (and prob. the second also, if Numenius is corrupt) is based upon Porphyry, *Συμπτικὰ Σητήματα*, as is Priscian *Solutions* I. p. 558 foll., and both represent teaching of Ammonius. Ueber Eratosthenes Katasterismen (J. Böhme.) Demonstrating against Maass the Eratosthenic origin of the Catasterismi.

Under the head of *Miscellen*: Zu Petronius cap. 58 (L. Friedländer.) 'The three riddles are all from spinning and weaving: the first denotes the process of weaving; the second is the spindle; the third, distaff and spindle.' Zu Quintilian (E. Wölfflin.) x. i. 60 *idem amarior for quoquam minor*. x. i. 63 *elegans et for dicendi vi*. x. i. 65 after *praecipuus* Halm's *est* and Wiegand's *et admirandus* should alike be removed. x. i. 69 *Hunc imitatus for Admiratus*. Ad Apulei *Metamorphoses* scripta J. Van der Vliet. ix. 8, p. 159, 18 f. Read *forte* and *bobus iungendo*. ix. 10, p. 160, 25 read *ut noxios* of Tac. *Ann.* v. 11. ix. 19, p. 166, 18 omit *festinal* and read *et ut magnis...percito nuntiat*. x. 7, p. 186, 12 insert *potui* after *seire*. x. 19, p. 194, 10 at *ille nequagnum curvans quam posset illi de me etc.* x. 25, p. 197, 26 insert *multis* before *spectatus*. x. 26 read *elisum* for *elius*. xi. 3, p. 206, 27 insert *vestis* or *tunica* before *rectoret*. xi. 20 read *cognitis...fabulis* for *[in]cognitis...familis*. Eine griechische Inschrift des Cyriacus (K. Schumacher.) From the Delian inser. in *Bull. de Corr. Hell.* I. p. 388, no. 37, restoring that in *Bull.* vi. p. 491, no. 4. Altteste lateinische Inschrift (F. B.) Found by Helbig and Dümmler on a golden fibula in a Palestinian tomb. It dates from the 6th century B.C. and is interesting chiefly for FHE: FAKED (retrograde) showing reduplicated perf and the aspirate character of the f. sound.

LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

BOOKS PUBLISHED IN ENGLAND.

Halleard (N. L.) *Genders of Greek Nouns*. 4 page card 8vo. London. D. Nutt. 3d.

Harris (J. R.) *The origin of the Leicester Codex of the New Testament*. 4to. 66 pp. Map and two facsimile plates. Cambridge. Pitt Press. 10s. 6d.

Herodotus. The Ionian revolt, extracted from Herodotus with Introduction and Notes by the Rev. E. D. Stone, M.A. 12mo. xi. 51 pp. Eton. Drake. 2s.

Lucian. Trips to the Moon. From the Greek, by Th. Francklin. 18mo. 192 pp. London. Cassell. 3d.

Ovid. Easy selections from Ovid in elegiac verse, arranged and edited with Notes, Vocabularies and Exercises in Latin Verse. Translation by H. Wilkinson. 16mo. 102 pp. London. Macmillan. 1s. 6d.

Paley (F. A.) *The truth about Homer*. With some remarks on Prof. Jebb's Introduction to Homer. 8vo. 24 pp. London. F. Norgate. 1s.

Plato. *Meno*. With Introduction and Notes by St. George Stock. 12mo. Oxford. Clarendon Press. 2s. 6d.

Torr (Cecil). *Rhodes in Modern Times*. 8vo. 160 pp. Three Plates. Cambridge. Pitt Press. 8s.

BOOKS PUBLISHED ON THE CONTINENT.

Ascoli (G. J.) *Sprachwissenschaftliche Briefe*. Automatische Uebersetzung von B. Gütterbock. 8vo. xvi. 228 pp. Leipzig. Hirzel. 4 Mk.

Avieni (Rufi Festi), *carmina*, rec. A. Holder. 8vo. (xv. 296 pp.) Innsbruck. Wagner. 10 Mk.

Band (O.) *Das attische Demeter-Kore-Fest der Epikleidia. Neuer Beitrag zur griechischen Heortologie*. Teil 1. 4to. 31 pp. Berlin. Gaertner. 1 Mk.

Belger (Chr.) *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der griechischen Kuppelgräber. With four Woodcuts*. 4to. 40 pp. Berlin. Gaertner. 1 Mk.

Berger (P.) *Note sur 300 nouveaux ex-voto de Carthage*. 8vo. 7 pp. (exz. Comptes-rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions).

Besobrasoff (Marie) *Ueber Plotin's Glückseligkeitslehre*. 8vo. 39 pp. Leipzig. Fock. 1 Mk.

Bethe (E.) *Quaestiones Dioloreae mythographae. Dissertation inaugura'is philologica*. 8vo. (106 pp.) Göttingen. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. 2 Mk. 40 Pf.

Blümner (H.) *Technologie und Terminologie der Gewerbe und Künste bei Griechen und Römern*. Bind IV. Abtheilung 2. Mit zahlreichen Abbildungen. 8vo. xiii. 379—627 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 7 Mk. 20 Pf.

Cornelii Nepotis vita selectae. Praemissae sunt breviores narrationes. Scholarium in usum ed. Adb. Meingast. 8vo. 47 pp. Wien. Manz. 40 Pf.

Duruy (V.) *Histoire des Grecs depuis les temps les plus reculés jusqu'à la réduction de la Grèce en province romaine. Nouvelle édition augmentée et enrichie de plus de 1,500 gravures et de 50 cartes*. Vol. I. Royal 8vo. 827 pp. 808 cuts and 9 maps. Paris. Hachette. 25 francs.

Eutropius. Para uso das escolas por A. E. da Silva Dias. 8vo. 155 pp. Porto. 400 reales.

Foerster (R.) *De Apulei quae fertur physiognomia recensenda et emendanda*. 8vo. 34 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 1 Mk. 20 Pf.

Frey (K.) *Das Leben des Perikles*. 4to. 35 pp. Leipzig. Fock. 1 Mk. 20 Pf.

Gasda (A.) *Kritische Bemerkungen zu Themistios. Fortsetzung*. 4to. 20 pp. Leipzig. Fock. 90 Pf.

Graeber (G.) *Einige Reste nebelgeordneter Satzgliedung in untergeordnetem Satzgefüge bei Thucydides und Xenophon, namentlich nach temporalen Vordersätzen*. 4to. 20 pp. Breukum. Christliche Buchhandlung. 1 Mk.

Hartmann (L. M.) *De exilio apud Romanos inde ab initio Bellorum Civilium usque ad Severi Alexandri principatum*. 8vo. 63 pp. Berlin. Weidmann. 1 Mk. 20 Pf.

Homolle (Th.) *Rapport sur une mission archéologique dans l'île de Délos*. 8vo. 51 pp. plate. Paris. (exz. Archives des missions scientifiques).

Lengnick (B.) *Der Bildungswerk der Lateinischen nach dem auf unseren Gymnasien herrschenden Betriebe*. 4to. 27 pp. Berlin. Gaertner. 1 Mk.

Lysias. *Discours contre Erastosthène, avec sommaires, analyses et notes par A. Mottet*. 12mo. 32 pp. Paris. Belin. 75c.

Magnus (H.) *Studien zu Ovids Metamorphosen*. 4to. 31 pp. Berlin. Gaertner. 1 Mk.

Mathias (Th.) *Zu alten Grammatikern*. 8vo. 47 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 1 Mk. 60 Pf.

Mayerhofer (A.) *Geschichtlich-topographische Studien über das alte Rom. With 1 map*. 8vo. iii. 115 pp. München. Lindauer. 2 Mk.

Phaedrus. Para uso das escolas. 8vo. xii. 141 pp. Lisbon. 450 reales.

Sallust. C. Sallusti Crispi Catilina Jugurtha ex historiis orationes et epistulae. In usum scholarum editid A. Eusner. 12mo. xxii. 146 pp. Leipzig. 45 Pf.

Scheins (M.) *Lateinische Syntax für Quartus und Tertia*. Im engsten Anschlusse an die Übungsbücher von Dr. Meiringh hrsg. 8vo. vi. 165 pp. Düsseldorf. Schwann. 2 Mk.

Schmidt (F. W.) *Kritische Studien zu den griechischen Dramatikern nebst einem Anhang zur Kritik der Anthologie*. Band III. Zu den klein. Frag. den Adespota, den Kom. u. der Anthologie. 8vo. 236 pp. Berlin. Weidmann. 7 Mk.

Schmidt (M. C. P.) *Zur Geschichte der geographischen Litteratur bei Griechen und Römern*. 4to. 27 pp. Berlin. Gaertner. 1 Mk.

Schmidt (O. E.) *Die handschriftliche Ueberlieferung der Briefe Ciceros an Atticus, Q. Cicero, M. Brutus in Italien*. Royal 8vo. 108 pp. with four plates. Leipzig. Hirzel. 6 Mk.

Theophylacti Simocattae historiae edidit Carolus de Boor. 12mo. xiv. 437 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 6 Mk.

Weber (L.) *Quaestiones Laconicarum capita II. Dissertatio inauguralis philologica*. 8vo. (64 pp.) Göttingen. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. 1 Mk. 60.

Wohlbrab (M.) *Die Platonhandschriften und ihre gegenseitigen Beziehungen*. 8vo. 85 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 2 Mk. 40 Pf.

Zingerle (A.) *Kleine philologische Abhandlungen*. Heft 4. Mit einem Sachregister zur ganzen Sammlung. 8vo. (viii. 104 pp.) Innsbruck. Wagner. 3 Mk. 20 Pf.

UNIVERSITY INTELLIGENCE.

(Continued from page 209.)

OXFORD.

UNIVERSITY PRIZES: *Stanhope Essay*, T. Secombe, Balliol (Felsted); *Acc.*, V. A. L. Fisher, New (Winchester), G. A. Wood, Balliol (Owens Coll.).

COLLEGES: *Christ Church Student*, W. Hobhouse, Fellow of Hertford (Eton); *House Sch.* (Math.), P. H. Jones (Christ's Hospital); *Exch.*, F. F. Liddell (Ch. Ch. Eton); *Trinity Fellow*, H. E. D. Blakiston, late scholar (Tonbridge).

NAT. SCIENCE: *Class 1.*—A. E. Buckhurst (Chemistry), Univ. (Rochester), E. B. Cook (Chemistry), Ch. Ch. (Manchester), J. B. Former (Botany), Magd. (Atherstone), J. R. Findlay (Chemistry), Ball. (Harrow), J. L. Hoskyns Abrahall (Chemistry), Magd. (Eton), O. H. Latter (Morphology), Keble, W. Overend (Physiology), Keble (Yorkshire Coll. Leeds), G. L. C. Pritchard (Physiology), Hertf. (Clifton), F. Pullinger (Chemistry), C. C. C. (Manchester), R. V. Williams (Morphology), Ch. Ch. (Westminster). *Class 2.*—E. H. Cartwright (Physiology), Ex., A. E. Field (Physics), Trin., F. A. Heron (Morphology), New, E. H. House (Chemistry), Trin., E. Mears (Chemistry), Queen's, W. A. Roberts (Chemistry), Non-Coll., B. B. Skirrow (Physics), Univ., J. F. Tristram (Chemistry), Mert., J. K. Wynne Edwards (Physics), Ch. Ch.

INDIAN LANGUAGES: *Class 2.*—L. G. Bhadbhade, Ball., N. S. Brodie, Ch. Ch., W. H. Lee, Joh., H. J. O'Beirne, Ball., E. Rogers, New.

CIVIL LAW: *Class 1.*—R. A. Shepherd, Trin. (Sedburgh). *Class 2.*—C. M. Laing, Magd., J. Oldfield, non-Coll., H. J. Turrell, Ex.

CAMBRIDGE.

UNIVERSITY SCHOLARSHIPS: *Craven Student* (Classics), E. A. Gardner, Caius (City of London); *Walker Student* (Pathology), J. W. Hunter, M.D. Edinburgh, F.R.S.E.; *Kennett Sch.* (Hebrew), I. R. V. Kennett, Queen's (Merchant Taylors'), 2. A. B. G. Lillington, Queen's (Merchant Taylors'); *Whewell* (Int. Law), 1. A. Ll. Davies, Trin. (Marlboro'), 2. A. B. Case, Trin.

UNIVERSITY PRIZES: *Mason* (Hebrew), R. V. Kennett, Queen's (Merchant Taylors'); *Yorke* (Law), T. E. Seruther, Trin. (Mill Hill and Univ. Coll. London); *Acc.*, E. Jenks, King's (Dulwich); *Minshall* (Pol. Econ.), S. M. Leathes, Trin. (Eton).

COLLEGES: *Clare Fellows*, A. Larmor (Belfast), C. R. Jessop (Uni. Coll. London); *Pembroke Fellows*, A. V. Leahy (Uppingham) and Trin. Coll. Dublin, E. G. Browne; *Caius* (Tancar Physic Student), A. L. Tatham (Lancaster); *Corpus Scholars* (Cl.) G. L. Richardson (Sheffield), 1st year; (Math.) J. L. Boulden (R. Inst.), 2nd year; *Queen's Hon. Fellow*, G. B. Finch; *Fellow*, W. R. Coates (Trin. Coll. Dublin); *Scholars*, (Math.) G. Duthie (Aberdeen), 1st year; (Cl.) W. R. Falkner (Weymouth), 1st year; *S. Catherine's Hon. Fellows*, Rt. Rev. H. Philpott, Bishop of Worcester; Rt. Rev. W. Boyd Carpenter, Bishop of Ripon, Rev. G. F. Browne.

ANNOUNCEMENTS: *Cavendish*. Two Scholarships of £30 per annum for 3 years for candidates under 17 on August 3rd, 1887, on which day the examination begins; subjects, classical and mathematical. Names to be sent in one week before.

CLASSICAL TRIPoS, Part I.—*Class I.*: *Division 1*, A. F. Ramsay, Girton; *Division 2*, J. H. Badley, Trin. (Rugby), L. G. B. J. Ford, King's (Repton), W. Loring, King's (Eton), G. L. Pilkington, Pemb. (Uppingham), F. W. Thomas, Trin. (Birmingham); *Division 3*, W. G. Headlam, King's (Harrow), F. G. Hughes, King's (Uppingham), H. Macmaster, Cai. (Liverpool College), N. A. North, Chr. (Blackheath), N. H. Rendall, Trin. (Harrow), G. Swift, Emm. (Oakham), J. N. H. Wing, Trin. (Bury St. Edmunds').

FORTHCOMING EXAMINATIONS.

ALL SOULS: (begins Oct. 26) one Fellowship in Law.

MAGDALEN: (begins Oct. 11) one Nat. Science Demanship (£80), candidates must be under 19 on 17 Oct.

BALLIOL: (begins Nov. 15) one law and history (Brackenbury) scholarship (£80); (begins Nov. 17) three classical scholarships (£80), candidates must be under 19 on Nov. 29; three classical exhibitions (£70); two mathematical scholarships (£80); two math. scholarships at QUEEN'S and CORPUS (£80) will be awarded on the same examination.

A combined examination (beginning Nov. 17) for Nat. Science scholarships and exhibitions. BALLIOL: one Sch. (£80), one Exh. (£40). EXETER: one Sch. (£80). CHRIST CHURCH: one Sch. (£80), one Exh. (£85). TRINITY: one Schol. (£80). No limits of age. Names sent to Master of Balliol on or before Nov. 10.

HERTFORD (begins Nov. 23), eleven scholarships: three open classical (£100); one open Math. (£100); two open (Lusby) scholarships (60); to the rest there are various restrictions. No limit of age.

BRASENOSE, PEMBROKE, WORCESTER, CHRIST CHURCH combined exam. for Mathematical scholarships (begins Nov. 29): one scholarship at each college (£80); and also two open exhibitions (about £30) at Worcester. Candidates for the scholarships must be under 19 on Dec. 3.

Class II.: *Division 1*, W. C. Bridgeman, Trin. (Eton), R. R. Frederick, Magd. (Yarmouth), E. Lewis, Corp. (Eton), W. C. MacDonald, Pemb. (Aberdeen), E. N. Marshall, Joh. (Sedburgh), S. W. Meek, Trin. (Harrow), C. R. Miller, Pemb. (Chr. Hosp.), B. Pares, Trin. (Harrow), E. H. Pearce, Pet. (Chr. Hosp.), R. N. Pope, Joh. (Merchant Taylors'), W. R. Prideaux, Queen's (City of London), F. S. Ranken, Queen's (Highgate), G. D. Scott, Trin. (Haileybury), F. W. G. Sidebotham, Cai., W. H. Ward, Clas. (Repton), H. F. J. Wright, Pemb. (Highgate), K. Liberty, Girton; *Division 2*, F. C. Beddard, Trin., H. F. E. Blanchard, Chr., H. S. Cronin, Trin., E. R. Ellis, Trin., R. H. Fuller, Emm., W. Greenstock, *Joh., C. W. Greenstreet, Chr., P. B. Halcombe, King's, R. O. Hutchinson, Jes., G. W. Kinman, Joh., H. C. Marillier, Pet., C. Marriott, Sid., E. B. Nicholson, Joh., F. H. Oates, Trin., F. G. Padwick, Trin., G. H. Peacock, Clas., H. C. Sharpe, Trin., T. H. Suton, Joh., P. Simpson, H. Selw., G. Stephenson, Trin., H. C. Stokes, Pemb., C. T. Whitmell, Sid., A. P. Williams-Freeman, Trin., J. J. Withers, King's, C. N. Ashford, Newham, E. M. Watson, Girton; *Division 3*, W. D. Barnes, Pemb., C. Buttar, Pemb., J. W. Eyre, Magd., D. T. B. Field, Joh., C. Gallacher, Trin., C. Hartley, Magd., V. C. Le Fanu, Trin., H. Manley, Emm., A. Neild, Pemb., F. R. Nethersole, Emm., F. E. New, Pet., W. H. S. Peake, Clas., F. L. Perkins, Pemb.; H. H. Schreiber, Clas., E. H. L. Watson, Cai., A. L. S. Riding, Girton.

CLASSICAL TRIPoS, PART II.—The letters *b*, *c*, *e*, appended to the name of a candidate denote the section or sections for which he is placed in the first class (*b* Philosophy, *c* History, *e* Language). The letter *a* indicates that a candidate has also attained a first class standard in section A (Translation and Composition). The asterisk denotes especial distinction.—*Class 1.*: E. W. Brooks (*a*, *e*), King's (Eton), R. S. Conway (*a*, *e*), Caius (City of London), W. Cowper (*e*), Pemb. (Canterbury), P. Giles (*a*, *c*, *e*), Caius (Aberdeen), R. S. Haydon (*e*), Christ's (S.

Paul's), J. W. Headlam (b, c), King's (Eton), C. E. T. Headlam (a, b), Trin. H. (Haileybury), E. G. W. Hewlett (e), Trin. (Owens College), E. C. Marchant (c*), Pet. (Christ's Hospital), R. R. Ottley (b), Trin. (Wellington), J. L. A. Paton (a*, c*), Joh. (Nottingham and Shrewsbury), C. A. McL. Pond (c), Joh. (City of London), N. Wedd (a, c), King's (City of London), C. Williams (a*, b), Trin. (Eton), L. Pocock (b), Newnham, M. Powell (e), Newnham.

Second Class : C. S. H. Bierston, Joh., D. E. Clapton, Magd., F. H. C. Marshall, Sid., R. W. Philipps, Cath., J. R. C. P. Tomlin, Pemb., J. H. Vince, Christ s.

MATHEMATICAL TRIPOS, Part I.—*Wranglers* : 1, H. F. Baker, Joh. (Perse School), A. W. Flux, Joh. (Portsmouth), J. C. Iles, Trin. (Lancing), J. H. Mitchell, Trin. (M. Ilbourn), 5, J. B. Peace, Emman. (Aberdeen); 6, E. W. Brown, Christ's (Tottenham Park); 7, N. J. Berry, Trin. (Pr. Tuit.); 8, J. T. Little, Trin. (Framlingham and King's College, London); 9, W. G. Clay, Trin. (Cheltenham), T. Varley, Joh. (University College, London); 11, L. S. Milward, Pemb. (Malvern), E. Young, Christ's (Trent); 13, W. D. Eggar, Trin. (Brighton); 14, T. L. Atkinson, Christ's (Doncaster), H. E. Soper, Trin. (S. Paul's); 16, H. R. Norris, Joh. (University College School); 18, J. E. Browne, Sidney (Tiverton), G. Osborn, Emman. (Kingswood and Eastbourne); 20, H. Douglas, King's (Eton), C. S. Vaughan, Trin. (Harrow); 22, W. W. Bryant, Pemb. (Brampton), F. Sergeant, Trin. (Derby); 23, R. L. Jones, Corpus (Breckon); 25, H. O. Fox, King's (Marlborough), A. Thornton Christ's (Giggleswick); 26, H. H. Holland, Sidney (Walsall); 27, G. F. Perrott, Jes. (Ealing); 28, H. W. Saw, King's (Blackheath), G. F. C. Searle, Pet. (Pr. Tuit.); 30, W. J. Sharples, Queen's (Manchester). *Senior Optimes* : 1, S. F. Card, Joh.; 2, A. Robinson, Jes.; 3, C. E. Holland, Christ's; 4, J. A. Hay, Clare, R. A. T. Stevens, Trin. H.; 6, J. Carter, Trin., J. T. Jolley, Cath.; 8, W. Dunn, Trin.; 9, W. O. Duncan, Pemb., C. W. Herbert, Trin., H. S. Mundahl, Joh.; 12, H. N. Hopgood, Trin.; 13, H. Hancock, Joh.; 14, H. G. N. Foyster, Trin., H. E. Pownall, Pet.; 16, E. L. Hartley, Pemb.; 17, W. H. N. Hope, Trin., E. Kitchener, Christ's; 19, H. J. T. Baker, Jes., J. W. Bragg, Emman.; 21, W. A. Russell, Joh.; 22, H. J. R. Lawrence, Trin. H.; 23, E. G. Allport, Christ's, J. N. Benfield, Trin.; 25, H. H. Cooper, Joh., E. F. Hadfield, H. Selw.; 27, S. Symonds, Cath.; 28, A. H. Summers, Cath.; 29, E. B. Badcock, Sidney; 30, R. P. Marriott, Cath.; 31, J. G. Garnett, Cath.; 32, R. L. Lewis-Lloyd, Jes.; 33, G. S. Back, Trin., C. C. T. Perez, Clare; 35, N. W. Campion, Queens', H. F. Nesbitt, Clare; 37, W. E. Bryan, Trin., C. Marsh, Clare. *Women* : H. Browne, Newnham (bracketed with 12); B. A. Holme, Girton (bracketed with 16); M. S. Raymond, Girton (between 18 and 19); B. Whalley, Girton (bracketed with 22); E. Walters, Newnham (between 22 and 23); M. Atkins, Newnham (bracketed with 25); M. S. Richards, Newnham (between 30 and 31); K. T. Wallas, Girton (bracketed with 32).

MORAL SCIENCES TRIPOS.—*Second Class* : E. E. Goodacre, Joh., J. R. W. Mowbray, Joh., A. N. Stapley, Joh. *Women*. *Second Class* : A. M. Anderson, Girton, C. R. Collins, Girton, M. E. Lowndes, Girton, M. C. Sturge, Newnham.

MATHEMATICAL TRIPOS, Part II.—*Class I. Division 1* : C. W. C. Barlow, Pet. (Edinburgh), G. H. Bryan, Pet., A. C. Dixon, Trin. (Kingswood), W. C. Fletcher, Joh. (Kingswood), C. Platts, Trin. (City of London and University College, London); *Division 2* : W. M. Coates, Queen's (Trinity College, Dublin), F. W. Hill, Joh. (Manchester); *Division 3* : J. Clark, Pemb. (Aberdeen), H. G. Dawson, Christ's (Trinity College, Dublin).

Class II. Division 1 : E. H. Askwith, Trin. (Christ's Hospital); *Division 2* : J. P. Johnson, Pet. (Trinity College, Dublin), A. McAulay, Caius (Kingswood and Owens College), W. Nicolls, Pet. (Trinity College, Dublin); *Division 3* : J. Tate, Joh. (Belfast).

SEMITIC LANGUAGES TRIPOS.—*Class I.* : A. A. Bevan, Trin.

Class II. : H. S. Alken, Queen's.

LAW TRIPOS.—*Class I.* : 1, G. G. Alexander, Down. (Priv. Tuit.), T. A. Herbert, Joh. (Mill Hill and Owens College), G. J. R. Murray, Trin., J. Windsor, Joh. (Owens College); 5, W. Archbold, Pet.; 6, W. Summers, Trin.; 7, H. E. Wright, Trin. (Cheltenham); 8, T. E. Chisenhale-Marsh, Trin. (Eton); 9, W. Barrington, Trin.

Class II. : 1, G. Grey, Joh., J. C. Ingle, King's, R. Lyte, Trin. H.; 4, E. H. Mallet, King's, D. J. Wanless, Trin.; 6, R. A. Sharp, King's; 7, S. J. W. N. Greenidge, Joh., L. R. Holland, King's, T. F. Howell, Joh., H. J. Morgan, Trin. H.; 11, G. N. Hind, Joh., Count G. N. Strickland, Trin.; 12, P. Yasuhiro.

NATURAL SCIENCES TRIPOS, Part I.—H. C. Anderson, Cai. (Harrow), C. A. Berber, Chr. (Kingswood), E. K. Colbeck, Cai. (Wellington College, N. Z.), J. P. d'Albuquerque, Joh. (City of London), S. F. Dufton, Trin. (Bradford), A. Dufton, Non. Coll. (Bradford), W. T. Elliott, Chr. (Newcastle), A. G. Francis, King's (University College School), R. E. Fry, King's (Clifton), M. Graham, Joh., T. T. Groom, Joh. (University College, London), H. Richardson, King's (Priv. Tuit.), F. R. Tenant, Cai. (Newcastle, Staff.), F. M. Turner, Trin. (City of London), E. P. Waggett, Pemb. (Charterhouse), W. H. Wagstaff, Sid. (Merchant Taylors'), C. E. Williams, Cai.

Class II. : F. E. Batten, Trin., A. E. Bodington, Cai. J. W. Campbell, Cav., C. Cargill, Jes., A. Carling, Joh., C. A. Carus-Wilson, Pemb., R. F. d'Arcy, Cai., H. E. Davies, Cai., J. R. Ellis, Trin., W. C. P. Ellis, Cath., T. H. Evans, Joh., G. E. Hale, King's, A. S. Hall, Cai., C. P. Handson, Cai., J. F. Hartin, Down., T. H. Haydon, Cai., W. M. Hayward, Sid., S. Herbert, Cai., H. L. Joseland, Chr., A. F. Kellett, Joh., S. M. Kingdon, Chr., S. H. A. Lambert, Joh., W. S. Lazarus-Barlow, Down., F. C. Martley, Trin., J. Owen, Sid., S. Parkes, Emman., G. Percival, Joh., H. G. L. Pryce, Pemb., C. E. Rice, Cai., E. A. Shaw, King's, W. W. Stabb, Cai., J. H. Staines, Sid., J. W. W. Stephens, Cai., J. D. Stubbs, Trin., C. R. A. Sutton, Cl., T. J. Watts, Queen's, D. Wessels, King's, W. S. West, Joh., J. H. Wilks, Cai., A. E. Wright, Trin., J. C. Wright, Joh.

Women.—*Class I.* : E. E. Field, Newnham, A. J. Flavell, Newnham, M. M. Smith, Newnham.

Class II. : I. C. Fortey, Newnham, E. R. Saunders, Newnham, M. A. Sewell, Newnham, C. L. Skeat, Newnham, J. C. Vinter, Girton.

Part II. : 1, R. H. Adie (Chemistry), Trin. (Royal School of Mines and Int. Coll., London), W. Coulbridge (Chemistry), Emman. (Exeter), A. C. Durham (Physiology), Christ's (University College School), F. H. Edgeworth (Physiology), Cai. (Clifton), P. Lake (Geology), Joh. (Newcastle College of Science), W. S. Melsome (Physiology), Owens (Lancing), A. B. Kendle (Botany), Joh. (Southwick), G. S. Turpin (Chemistry), Joh. (Nottingham and Owens College); 2, J. C. H. Blake, Trin., A. Campbell, Corpus, A. W. Day, Caius, H. E. Durham, King's, H. M. Fletcher, Trin., P. P. Groom, Trin., F. Hird, Trin., H. A. Roberts, Caius.

HISTORICAL TRIPOS.—*Class I.* : 1, G. T. Warner, Jes. (Newton Abbot); 2, E. Jenks, King's (Dulwich), J. F. Kendall, King's (King's College, London); 4, J. P. Malleson, Trin.; 5, C. A. Houfe, Queen's. *Women* : M. Bateson, Newnham (between 1 and 2), E. C. Moore, Newnham (equal to 4), M. K. Griffiths, Newnham (equal to 4).

Class II. : 1, W. A. Lewis, King's; 2, R. Bickersteth, Pemb., T. M. Evans, King's; 4, G. R. Sanders, Trin.; 5, H. C. S. Dumas, Trin. Hall, S. H. Grange, Trin., W. G. Selwyn, King's; 8, H. J. Carpenter, King's. *Women* : B. Paul, Newnham (equal to 1), K. J. Pattinson, Newnham (between 4 and 5), E. A. Bebbington, Newnham (equal to 5).